

GÁBOR TAKÁCS

Layers of the Oldest Egyptian Lexicon I

Abstract

The paper re-examines the controversies of P. Lacau's old observation on a binary opposition of the anatomical terminology of Ancient Egyptian in the context of many new results issuing from current progress in Afro-Asiatic (Semito-Hamitic) comparative linguistics. The presented etymological examination of the Ancient Egyptian anatomical terminology corroborated a surprising distribution: one member of the synonymous pairs is usually a Semitic word, whereas the other one(s) have non-Semitic cognate(s) solely attested in some of the African branches of our language macrofamily. A relatively deeper presence of the extra-Semitic vocabulary in Egyptian has also become apparent.

Introduction

Already P. Lacau (1970, 30, fn. 2) has observed in the Egyptian lexicon „une série d'organes qui on eu ainsi un double nom: 'le cœur': jb et ḥ3.tj ...; 'les sourcils': smd. wj et jnh.wj ...; 'la tempe': m3ʕ et sm3 ...; 'le poumon' zm3 et wf3.w ...; 'le poing': 3mm.t et ḥfʕ ...; 'l'ongle': 3b et ʕn.t ...". Elsewhere (o.c., p. 92): „Quant à l'existence simultanée de deux désignations pour un même organe, nous en avons d'autres exemples en égyptien" such as tp vs. d3d3, zm3 vs. wf3, jnh vs. smd etc. and „un des deux noms devient alors une survivrance d'une appellation primitivement différente de l'autre nom". Lacau has already put the unanswered question I am venturing here to examine below: „Bien d'autres parellélismes entre mots pratiquement équivalents demanderaient à être étudiés. Quels sont les sens premiers et la différence qui peut subsister encore entre d.t et nh; ʕ3 et wr?"

Working on the introductory chapter of the „Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian" (cf. esp. EDE I 36-38) surveying the diverse segments of the ancient Egyptian lexical

stock 15 years ago, I was also impressed – to be frank, not yet aware of Lacau's above cited observation – to see the mostly binary opposition of the anatomical terminology in a surprising distribution: one member of these synonymous pairs was usually clearly reflecting a Semitic word, whereas the other one, on the contrary, appeared to have a non-Semitic cognate solely attested in some of the African branches of the Afro-Asiatic (Semito-Hamitic) language family. This phenomenon is worth being thoroughly examined as it might also shed light on the prehistory of the Egyptian language. It is now high time that this research be done in the frames of my current project (ongoing since 2012) aiming at mapping linguistic aspects of the Egyptian linguo- and ethnogenesis.¹ Below, in this first part, I am going to scan all these pairs from upper torso to the hair of head with an extensive etymological analysis, eager to elucidate the question whether my impression fifteen years ago was right. Finally, I try to sum up the distribution of „Semitic” vs. „African” segments of these pairs and venture to outline what is to be deduced thereof. Later, it should also be checked in some other segments of the primary or basic (i.e., inherited, not borrowed) lexicon, e.g. that of the natural phenomena, where, e.g., we have two basic words for the „sun” (r^c having an Arabic cognate vs. jtn with non-Semitic parallels). Or, e.g., why do we have two synonymous terms for „eternity” (non-Semitic ḥḥ vs. d.t with an Akkadian cognate)² used parallel throughout the millennia?

„Hair”

Eg. sr „1. (Lit. MK, LP) vom Haar einer Frau (wohl von der künstlichen Perrücke im Gegs. zum natürlichen Haar, 2. (Med., GR) Haar eines Tieres” (Wb IV 191, 3-4) = „1. tress, wig, 2. hide (of animal)” (FD 235) > Cpt. (S) **cIP** „Haar, Streifen” (NBÄ),³ A fem. form of this word is also attested: sr.t „Haar (des Rindes)” (LP, Wb IV 191, 5). These words were arbitrarily explained J. Osing from a far-fetched deverbial root etymology.⁴

¹ The project has been supported by a Bolyai research fellowship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences since autumn 2012, which the author gratefully acknowledges. The lexical-etymological data issue from the author's long-range project for an Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian (EDE, whose first 3 volumes have already been published, Leiden with Brill, 1999-2008), which were accumulated for the present paper in spring 2014 in Székesfehérvár. The data were evaluated and the ideas to be deduced thereof were formulated in summer 2014 at Balatonederics.

² Eg. d.t „Ewigkeit” (OK-, Wb), which J. Osing (NBÄ 760, n. 919) erroneously tried to derive from Eg. dwj (hapax of obscure meaning, pSmith 18:3, v. supra) referring to an unconvincing semantical parallel not fitting the case (Eg. q3j „hoch sein” > q3.w „Höhe” → „lange Zeit”), has long been successfully identified by a few authors (Hommel 1904, 110, fn. 1; Holma 1919, 47; GÄSW #931; Vycichl 1958, 383) with Sem.: Akk. šātu > šātu „ferne Zukunft, Ewigkeit” [Holma] = „ferne Zeit” [AHW] = „ferne Zukunft” [Vycichl] = „distant time, far-off days (with reference to past and future)” [CAD]. The synonymous Eg. (n)ḥḥ, in turn, appears to be an innovative derivation from the basic sense „high number”, cf. ḥḥ „Million, große Zahl” (I-, Wb III 152-3).

³ Which may have passed into Nubian, cf. Kunuzi, Mahassi sīr “Haar” as suggested by E. Zyhlarz (1934-5, 172).

⁴ The nominal forms were ultimately derived by him (NBÄ 250) from Eg. srj “ausbreiten” (GR, Wb 191, 15), i.e., from a verbal root attested almost two millennia later than its supposed nominal derivative. On the top of this, Osing (NBÄ 823, n. 1097) tried to justify this with a forced typological parallel, German Strähne < IE *str-ei- “ausbreiten” (Kluge 1999, 800, 802), although either this root or its two sporadic Germanic reflexes with

Instead of such an artificial *Wurzeletymologie*⁵ forced upon Eg. sr, one might consider its comparison with Sem. * \sqrt{s}^{r} „hair” suggested by C.T. Hodge (1976, 12, #45) as phonologically not entirely impossible, albeit it looks *prima vista* to be hindered by two fundamental obstacles.⁶ Further Afro-Asiatic cognates, however, may complicate the question, cf. Brb. * \sqrt{zr} „hair” (primary noun) and hence: „to pluck hair” (denom. verb) [GT] > NBrb.: Tamazight a-zzar „cheveux, chevelure”, ta-mzur-t, pl. ti-mzur-in „1. mèche de cheveux tombant sur les joues, 2. crête de cheveux au milieu du crâne”, zzer „1. épiler, 2. débarrasser une peau de sa laine, 3. déplumer, 4. arracher (herbe, cheveux, poils)” [Taïfi 1991, 811] || SBrb.: ETawllemmet & Ayr ə-zər „1. être dépouillé de ses cheveux / poils / sa laine (par maladie, grattage, arrachage), être dépilé, 2. être plumé (avoir ses plumes enlevées)”, ETawllemmet i-zəzar (nomen instr.) „poils, laines provenant de peaux d’animaux morts qu’on a dépouillées de leurs poils, 2. poils rasés ou arrachées” [PAM 2003, 897] || NOm.: Dizoid *sār- „hair” [GT] > Dizi sar [Flm.] = sār-u [Keefer] = sárú [Bender] = sār-ū [Bender],⁷ Maji sārū „hair of head” [Bender 1971, #35] (Dizoid: Bender 2003, 211, #65) || WCh.: Hausa còrò ≈ túkkú „1. plait of hair on crown of head, 2. bird’s crest or cock’s comb” [Abr. 1962, 890, 896] = „1. a cock’s comb, 2. a small tuft of hair on the front of head” [Brg. 1934, 1043].⁸ All these reflexes – except for Sem. – appear to suggest a PAA * \sqrt{cr} „hair” [GT].⁹ Hausa c- (ts-) can regularly derive from PAA *c-, but not from a lateral. Brb. *z is equally regular < both PAA *c and *ĉ, whereas Eg. s- is a direct match of AA *c-, although its rare correspondence with

the basic sense “strip” have clearly nothing to do with the notion “hair, hide” in general. The same is the case with the Swedish stripa “herabhängender Haarbüschel” < *str-ei-b- (IEW 1028-9).

⁵ Unfortunately, Osing’s NBĀ abounds in this kind of „etymologies”, many of which – through a more thorough examination with careful outlook at the AA data – have eventually turned out to be but pure fancy, cf. Takács 2005.

⁶ C.T. Hodge’s (1976, 12, #45) direct equation of Eg. sr with Sem. * \sqrt{s}^{r} „hair” fails, since (1) Eg. s- vs. Sem. *š- are not regular and (2) Sem. *-l- is not reflected in Eg. (where the expected reflex *š^r/3 would not have been incompatible). There are, however, several instances of an irregular correspondence of Eg. s- to Sem. *š-, cf. Eg. sr „Vornehmer, Fürst” (PT, Wb IV 188-9) vs. Sem. *šarr- „king, chief” [Djk.] (cf. Hommel 1883, 440, fn. 30; GB 795; Djk. 1965, 43; 1970, 472, fn. 89; Conti 1978, 28, fn. 2) or Eg. srf „warm sein” (PT-, Wb IV 195) vs. Sem. *šrp „to burn” [GT] (cf. Hommel 1883, 440, fn. 30; GÄSW 103-4; WUS #2690; Conti 1978, 28, fn. 1). As for the *-l- not reflected in Egyptian and Berber, it might perhaps be a Semitic innovation as root extension.

⁷ The Dizi-Eg. comparison was first suggested by A.Ju. Militarev (1991, 264, #38.11). Militarev, however, also compared NBrb.: Iznasen ə-ššar „волосы, шерсть” provided it is not a late loan from Ar. ʔaš-ša^r- (in that case, though, when borrowed into NBrb., its -l- would have been retained).

⁸ O.V. Stolbova (1987, 201, #520) erroneously equated the Hausa term with Bokkos syah “hair” (misquoted as syah and assuming hence the regular shift of h/ĉ < *r, which, however, does not apply for h), which is rather akin to its closest cognates Fyer-Tambas so and Daffo-Butura swé „Haar” [Jng. 1970, 387] indicating Ron *s^wah ~ *s^yah, which can have nothing to do with Stolbova’s artificial WCh. *ĉAHAr- „hair” (motivated by her equally false comparison with Sem. *š^r). Note that Hausa šaari (sic) „hair on the chest of a ram” quoted by Orel (HSED l.c.) in comparison with Bokkos syah (sic, -h), Dizoid *sār-, and Sem. *š^r is not recorded in Brg. 1934, 930 and Abr. 1962, 808.

⁹ It is to be noted that SAgaw: Awngi cəri „hair of tail” [Hetzron 1978, 138] does not belong here. Its Cushitic cognates indicate a proto-form *ĉVr- „tail” (cf. Leslau 1979 III 187), which, by the way, might correspond to Sem. *ṭahr- „back”.

the initial Sem. lateral *š- < AA *ĉ- has also been observed. Sem. *š-, in turn, seems to originate from PAA *ĉ-. Therefore, if we accept the relatedness of the Hausa form, there seem to emerge two diverse PAA root varieties, namely *√cr vs. *√ĉr „hair”. The *lautgeschichtliche* situation in NOM. is not yet as clear so the data thereof are of no evidence value in this matter as yet. In any case, Eg. sr „hair” has presumably a Sem. cognate, whereas its synonym (below) has not.

Eg. šn > šnw ~ šnj „Haar” (PT-, Wb IV 499-501), whose old equation with Sem. *√s^cr „hair”¹⁰ is evidently untenable for phonological reasons, may be better affiliated with a set of cognates ultimately deriving from an old PAA stem *Sin¹¹ „hair” [GT] – which is only attested outside Semitic – with diverse C₃ root extensions:

(1) AA *Sink- [GT] > NOM. *isink- „hair” [GT]: Basketo išinč, Zergula & Zayse isijke (NOM. data quoted from Mkr. and Blz.v.s) ||| CCh.: Gude cinkína (ts-) [Str.] = šinkân [Meek] = šinjin [Krf.] = šinkin [IL].

(2) AA *SinT- [GT] > NBrb.: Shilh-Sus a-šentuf „hair” [Dst. 1938, 62] = a-šantuf „chevelure” [Laoust], Senhazha senžef „arracher (cheveux, poils, alfa)” [Rns. 1932, 350] ||| Bed. šindáw (m) „fine head of hair, esp. on young girl” [Roper 1928] ||| CCh.: PHigi *ĉint- > *šint- „hair”¹² [GT] = *√sn [JS]: Fali-Kiria šinči [Krf.], Higi čenti [Str.], Higi-Ghye šinži [Krf.], Higi-Futu činši [Krf.], Higi-Nkafa šanti [Meek], Higi-Kamale čânči [Meek], Higi-Nkafa, -Baza, -Kamale šinti „hair” [Krf.], Kapsiki šinti [Str. 1922-3, 113].¹³

Which of these two AA stems is reflected by Eg. šntj „Haar” (Med., Wb IV 518, 12-13) is uncertain. It is clearly an extension of the simplex still and solely¹⁴ preserved by Eg. šn, although its -tj was originally not necessarily a dental plosive, but may very well be explained – with the well-known shift of old t > tj in the NK – from an older Eg. *šnt (unattested from the OK and MK), which would be a perfect match of AA *√Snk.

Eg. f^c (or f^c3)¹⁵ ~ f^cj (hair det.) „lock of hair” (NE, Pap. Turin 1983, vo. I 47-48, Černý 1958, 210, #6 after I.E.S. Edwards) = „cheveux” (AL 77.1544) = „lock of hair”

¹⁰ Suggested by A. Ember (1926, 301-2, n. 10), W. F. Albright (1927, 230), and M. Cohen (1947, 138), but rightly doubted by F. von Calice (GÄSW 206, #852) and C.T. Hodge (1976, 20, #45).

¹¹ Its *S- stands for an unknown sibilant. Eg. š- evidently speaks for an initial lateral fricative or affricate, but the rest of the comparanda from NBrb., NOM. and Ch. seem to derive from some other sibilant (*s- or *č-?), although the data from the latter two subbranches are unfortunately not too helpful in deciding about which sort of the PAA sibilants is to be reconstructed.

¹² Rather than **sint- > *šint- via palatalization of the initial sibilant.

¹³ For the comparison of the AA data see Wölfel 1955, 49 (Eg.-NBrb.); Mukarovsky 1989 MS, 3 (NOM.-CCh.); Blažek 1994 MS Bed., 35 (Bed.-NOM.-CCh.).

¹⁴ It is to be noted that CCh.: Bata-Garwa ssëöné „Haar” [Str.] cannot belong here as cognate reflecting the same biradical root, since it is to be analyzed via a quite different segmentation < *sew-ne.

¹⁵ Can be read either f^c3 or f^c (group writing). The suggested Afro-Asiatic etymology of the word indicates that the Old Egyptian root was either *f^c3 < *f3^c (met.) or *f^c < *f3^c („lost” -3-). I prefer the second scenario.

(DLE I 190) = „Haarlocke” (GHWb 305)¹⁶ > Dem. f^o ~ f^oj ~ fj „Haar” (DG 144, 4) → Cpt. (OSF) 𓆎𓅓, (S) 𓆎𓅓 ~ 𓆎𓅓𓆎, (SBL) 𓆎𓅓𓆎, (A) 𓆎𓅓𓆎, (AL) 𓆎𓅓𓆎𓅓, (M) 𓆎𓅓𓆎, (BF) 𓆎𓅓𓆎, (F) 𓆎𓅓𓆎𓅓 ~ 𓆎𓅓𓆎𓅓 „hair” (CD 623a; CED 265; KHW 345): as I suggested elsewhere (Takács 1999, 20), NEg. f^o3 < OEg. *f3^o < *fr^o is cognate with Sem. *par^o- „capelli fluenti” [Fronzaroli] = *par(a)^o- „hair (on top of the head)” [Belova et al. 1994 MS, #77] = *par^o- „(loose) hair of the head” [SED]¹⁷ || NBrb.: Mzab tu-frə-t, pl. tu-fra-t-in „mèche bouclée de cheveux” [Dlh. 1984, 50] || EBrb.: Ghadames ta-frī-t, pl. ta-fra-t-īn „1. mèche de cheveux qui s’arrondit sur le front, 2. languette de chausson ou de chaussure qui recouvre le dessus du pied, ornée ou non de broderies de soie” [Lanfry 1973, 94, #140] || LECu.: perhaps Afar būr^o-i [irreg. b-] „tight wooly hair (like that of a negro)” [PH 1985, 74] || CCh.: Lame pēr „favoris, poils du visage” [Sachnine 1982, 268] < AA *√fr^o „hair” [GT].¹⁸

„Head”

Eg. d3d3 „Kopf” (OK, Wb V 530-531), whose Coptic reflex (S) 𓆎𓅓𓆎 is to be deduced from *dād < **dā3dā3, has long been convincingly¹⁹ equated with Sem. *gulgul-(at-) „cranio” [Frz. 1964, 268, #2.43] = *gulgul-at-/ *galgal-at- „skull” [Kogan] > Akk. gulgullu ~ gulgullatu „Schädel” [AHW 297] = „1. skull, 2. container shaped like a human skull” [CAD g 127-8] || Hbr. gulgolet (≈ Gk. κρᾶνίον τοπος) „Schädel, Kopf” [GB 139] = „skull” [KB 191] = gulgōlet „Schädelstätte” [Eilers 1987, 513] (hence Gk. Γολγᾶθᾶ), PBHbr. gulgo/ōlet „1. Kopf, Schädel (eig. etwas Rundes), 2. (übertr.) Kopfgeld (eine kgl. Steuer)”, galgālōn ~ galgālōn „Turban, der um den Kopf gebunden wird” [Levy 1924 I 330], JArām. gulgultā ~ gulgālā „1. Schädel, 2. Kuge, runder Stein, 3. Kopfsteuer/geld” [Dalman 1922, 79; Levy l.c.] = gulgultā ~ gulgaltā „skull, head” [Jastrow 1950, 221], JPArām. gōgaltā ~ gūlgūltā [DRS], CPArām. gwlglwt? „skull” [KB], Samar. Arām. glgh [DRS], Syr. gāgoltā „cranium” [Brk. 1928, 103b] | Ar. ḡalaḡ-at- [Kogan: < *ḡalḡal-at-?]

¹⁶ S. Sauneron (1964, 20) pointed out the word for GR, namely in the Abaton Decree, which prohibited to approach the holy place for z nb hr f^o „everyone with hair”. Beside this occurrence, Sauneron (1968, 10) proved the phonetic value f of the hair hrgl. in Esna (GR), supposedly created on the basis of the acrophonic principle from LEg. f^o „hair”.

¹⁷ Attested in Akk. pērtu ~ pērtu „Haupthaar” [AHW 856] = pirtu „Haupthaar” [Holma 1911, 34] = pirtu „Kopfhaar” [Torczyner 1912, 770] || Hbr. pera^o „das volle Haupthaar” [GB 660] = „loosely hanging and unplaited hair on the head” [KB] || Ar. far^o- „das volle Haupthaar” [GB] = „chevelure” [BK] = „hair of women, shag of hair (космы волос)” [SISAJa] (Sem.: Holma 1911, 34; Frz. 1964, 268, #2.46; SISAJa I, #46; Belova 1992, 16; SED I 192, #218). The inner Semitic etymology (if any) of Sem. *par^o- has been debated. Connected to Sem. *√pr^o „to grow” [GT] (as suggested in GB 660; Frz. 1964, 268, #2.46; WUS #2277)? Cf. esp. Hbr. √pr^o III qal „das Haar wachsen lassen, es nicht stutzen und pflegen” [GB]. S.D. Ricks (1982, 298), in turn, associated Hbr. pera^o „hairs of the head” with OSA: Qatabanian fr^o-m „top, summit of”, Ar. far^o- „top”, fara^oa „to excel”. Torczyner (1912, 770) attached Akk. pirtu to Ar. farw-at- „Kopfhaut samt Haaren”.

¹⁸ Any connection to Sem.: Ar. ʿufr-at- „crinière”, ʿifr-at- „cheveux du milieu de la tête” [Belova] || ECu.: Dullay-Gollango ufur-kō „Körperhaar” [AMS 1980, 246] as suggested by A.G. Belova (1992, 16; 1998, 14)?

¹⁹ For disproving the phonologically unacceptable Rösslerian etymology of Eg. d3d3 (Akk. qaqqadu < *√kdḳd) cf. Takács 2006, 102-3.

„1. crâne, 2. tête” [BK I 311]²⁰ (Sem.: Holma 1911, 11; DRS 118; SED I 74-75, §79). The exclusively Semito-Egyptian isogloss $*\sqrt{gl}gl$ was in fact the reduplication of AA $*\sqrt{gl}$ „head, skull” [GT]. Following the old view expressed frequently both in Sem. and Eg. linguistics (lit. *infra*), I have examined elsewhere (Takács 1994 and 1998) the etymological connection of the reflexes of Eg.-Sem. $*ga/ulga/ul-$ „head” [GT] with other derivatives of AA $*\sqrt{gl}$ „round” [GT].²¹

Eg. tp „Kopf, Spitze” (PT-, Wb V 263-8): this synonymous term, interestingly, has again no match in Semitic. On the contrary, its cognate has so far been only found in HECu.: Burji $t\dot{p}-\acute{o}$ „skull” [Sasse 1982, 177] as V. Blažek (1994 MS Elam, 5, #13) correctly suggested. Interestingly, the vocalism in the 1st root syllable of the Eg. word was also $*-\acute{i}-$ as Eg. fem. $tp.t$, i.e. $*t\dot{p}.ăt$ > Cpt. (S) $\lambda\pi\epsilon$ (abstraction from $*tape$, in which initial $t-$ was falsely regarded and isolated in the pre-Coptic fem. form as the fem. definite article) indicates. One might perhaps extend this etymology onto CCh.: Daba $t\dot{p}$ „to wear a cap” [Brt. 1995, 226].

„Brain”

Eg. 3js [regular < $*rʔs$] „Gehirn” (Med., Wb I 2, 10-11) = „viscera”, 3js n $\underline{dnn}.t$ „the viscera of the skull, i.e.: brain” (FD 1) || Sem. $*raʔš-$ „head” [Frz. 1964, 268, #2.42] = $*raʔiš-$ [Dlg. 1986, 78] = $*raʔ(i)š-$ [SED I 198-9, #225]. The Egypto-Semitic match (observed first by O. Rössler 1966, 227 and then C.T. Hodge 1976, 12, #35) is certain, while the presence of the same Afro-Asiatic root in the Chadic daughter languages, as suggested by O.V. Stolbova (1991 MS, 7), seems to me phonologically dubious, cf. CCh. $*\sqrt{r}š$ (?) „brain” [GT]: PMandara $*\gamma urš-$ (?) [Krf.] > Glavda $\gamma uršà$ (-ł-) [Krf.] = $ruršà$ [Stl.], Nakatsa $\gamma oršà$ (-ł-) [Krf.], Zeghwana (Dghwede) $\gamma unza$ [Krf.] | PMafa-Mada (or PMatakam) $*haN-liš$ „brains” [Rsg.] = $*-riš$ (?) [GT] > Matakam (Mafa) $màngəřàš$ (-ł-) [Krf.], Mada $\acute{g}nèš$ (-tl) [Rsg.], Muyang $àndiš$ [Rsg.], Muktele $àrış$ [Rsg.], Moloko $èléš$ [Rsg.], Gisiga $\gamma eleş$ [Lukas 1970, 117] = $léš$ [Rsg.] (CCh.: Rossing 1978, 216, #88; Kraft 1981, #37). The sibilant C_3 may well indeed be due to the phenomenon of secondary laterals (i.e. $*-s$ > $*-š$) so typical in Central Chadic, but the *Lautgeschichte* of its C_2 (perhaps $-r$ < $*-n$ - due to Central Chadic rhotacism?) and the origin of the *Anlaut* (r - ~ γ - < $*h$ -, i.e., the well-known root extension occurring in the names of body parts?) are highly questionable. In any case, the Semitic and Egyptian roots are in a fully regular agreement.

Eg. tbn „Gehirn” (Med., Wb V 262, 1) = „bone-marrow” (FD 296) = „Knochenmark” (GHWb 922): its Chadic etymology is not yet fully certain in spite of the multitude of the attractive parallels, which are, however, not necessarily mutually interrelated:

²⁰ Note that the Ar. forms like $\acute{g}ul\acute{g}ul-at-$ [Holma] and $\acute{g}al\acute{g}al-at-$ [KB] – as Kogan (SED I.c.) rightly remarked – „are not found in the available dictionaries”.

²¹ As L. Kogan (SED I.c.) too has recently admitted, “*Sem. $*gll/*ggl$ ‘to be round’ ... may eventually be the source of Sem. ‘skull’*”.

(1) V. Orel and O. Stolbova (1992, 185; HSED #2393) identified Eg. *tb̄n* with CCh.: Gabin *t̄b̄n*-de „brains” [Kraft],²² where the final syllable could in principle be taken from **t̄b̄n*-indV (lit. *, „brain of head”) via haplology (cf. Gabin indè „head”). The ultimate pre-Central Chadic root might have thus been ***√tb̄n* → **√tb̄n* via the metathesis of the glottalization well-known in the Chadic *Lautgeschichte*. This is how our attention might be grasped by Ar. *ṭabana* „entendre bien, savoir bien une chose”, *ṭabin-* „habile, intelligent” [BK II 58], which has a variety in Ar. *tabina* „2. être intelligent, fin et rusé”, *tabin-* „habile, intelligent” [BK I 192]. If the above chain of assumptions is right, we have here an exclusive Egypto-Chadic isogloss with a possible verbal root background retained in Arabic.

(2) H.G. Mukarovskiy (1987, 108) combined the Gabin word with the reflexes of WCh.: Angas-Sura **tabur* ~ **tabuyur* ~ **tabuk* „brain” [GT 2004, 20] attested both in Angas and Suroid.²³ One would be tempted to assume that **tubuk* was originally due to a contraction of a compound **tubun-kā* „marrow of head” (cf. Angas-Sura **kā*₂ „head”). But the difference of the vowels in the 1st vs. 2nd syllables is atypical of original triconsonantal Angas-Sura roots and one has a priori the impression of having to do with a prefix *ta-* here, which seems to be reaffirmed by the isolated Goemay *goebûr* [gəbûr] „the brain” [Srl. 1937, 62], in which the same stem *-*bur* (or **buyur*) seems to appear, only with a different prefix (gə- < *kə-?). The same can by no means be the case with Eg. *tb̄n* and thus any comparison may be baseless.

(3) A noteworthy extra-Afro-Asiatic parallel to Eg. *tb̄n* appears in PBantu *-*dùbí* „brain” [Guthrie 1971, 126, #682]. But whether this is related with the Chadic data is highly unlikely.

Eg. **mm* „brain” (Med., FD 43; AECT I 190 and DCT 72: occurs already in CT III 331a) = „ein Körperteil im Kopf von Tieren, Teil des Welses: **Gehirn*” (GHWb 141; ÄWb II 504c; HAM 835) III Sem.: Ar. *ḡamm-at-* „tête” [Dozy II 226], perhaps also Ar. *ḡumām-* „rhume de cerveau” [BK II 499] III NOm.: Macro-/POmeto **ko/umm-* „head” [Bnd. 2003, 117, #67] III WCh.: NBauchi **ḡam-* „head” [GT]²⁴ | SBauchi **ḡām* „head”

²² Which has further possible Central Chadic cognates. Cf. Masa *toʔon-ta*, Banana *towən-dà*, Musey *totoʔon-da*, Lame *towám-bwà*, Lame-Peve *təʔom-wa*, Misme-Zime *toʔom* „brains” (CCh.: Kraft 1981), whose *Inlaut* -ʔ- is perhaps explainable in the light of Gabin *t̄b̄n*- and Banana *towən*-.

²³ Angas *tabur* „the brains” [Flk. 1915, 286] = *tàbùr* ~ *ntabùr* „Knochenmark, Mark” [Jng. 1962 MS, 29, 39] = *tabur* „brains” [ALC 1978, 61] = *tàbùr* „brains” [Krf.] = *ntabur* „brain” [Gochal 1994], Sura *tubùk* ~ *tàbùk* „Gehirn” [Jng. 1963, 85], Mupun *ntúbùk* ~ *ntúbùr* „1. pus, 2. brain”, *ntúbùr káa* ~ *tábùr káa* „brains” [Frj. 1991, 45, 62], Kofyar *dóevùgùr* ~ *dóepvògùr* [dóp̄və̀gùr, v- < *b-] „brain” [Netting 1967, 8].

²⁴ Attested in Warji *ḡàm-ái* [Skn.] = *ḡám-áy* [Jng.] = *ḡámá* [IL], Pa’a *hàamá* (fi-) [MSkn.] = *ʔam-á* (ʰam-á) [Jng.] = *hama* [IL], Siri *rammi* [ɣ-] [Gowers] = *ḡamí* [Skn.] = *ràmí* [IL], Diri *àmáh* [IL] = *àmá* [Skn.], Jimbin *ḡamá* [Skn.], Miya and Kariya *ḡam* [Skn.], Mburku *ḡāmo* [Skn.], Tsagu *aam-ai* [Skn.] (NBauchi: Skinner 1977, 25). One can hardly support Stolbova (1987, 226, #751; 1996, 75) in reconstructing NBauchi/WCh. **ḡama* in the light of a false comparison with Eg. *ḥ3* [< *ḥl] (!) „occiput” (FD 161), which fits neither phonologically nor semantically.

[TG pace Shimizu 1978] || CCh.: Masa yám „head” [Jng.] (Ch.: JI 1994 II 182-3) < AA * $\sqrt{y}mm$ „head” [GT].²⁵

„Temple”

Eg. gm3 „das Joch- und Schläfenbein des Kopfes” (Med., Wb V 170, 2) = „temple of head (a technical term peculiar to Pap. E. Smith)” (Ward 1972, 19, #124) = „cheekbone” (Allen 2000, 470) shares with **gmh.t** „Locke oder Flechte des Haares, Schläfe” (CT, Wb V 171, 15-17) = „1. temple of head, 2. plaited hair at the sides of the head” (Ward, l.c.)²⁶ the same biconsonantal root * \sqrt{gm} , which is to be affiliated with WCh.: Sha ġôm, pl. ġooma „Wange” [Jng. 1970, 285] || ECh.: Mubi-Toram *gūm- „cheek” [GT].²⁷ A few researchers²⁸ have combined the underlying AA root also with Sem.: Ar. ġumm-at-, „3. chevelure abondante et qui retombe sur les épaules (plus riche que celle wafr-at-), 4. toupet” [BK I 322] and Cu.-Om. *gamm- „mane” [Djk. 1981, 61] > ECu. *gamm- „fluff, mane” [Sasse 1982, 77] = „mane, stuff” [Blz.].²⁹

Eg. sm3 „1. behaarter Teil des Kopfes, Schläfengegend (mit Augenpartie, Haaransatz), Haare am Kopf, *Skalp, 2. Haarsträhne, 3. Seite, 4. auch von den Schamhaaren” (PT-, Wb IV 122, 1-6; GHwB 703; ÄWb I 1123a; ÄWb II 2203b-c) = „1. scalp, locks of hair, 2. temoral region, side-locks, 3. to listen (to)” (CT, DCT 492-3) = „crown of the head with hair growing on it (the hair itself, not the location of it)” \approx gmh.w (GR Edfu, PL 841) > (SBF) **cmay** (pl., originally a dual < sm3.wj) „Schläfen, Augenlider, Wimpern” (KHW 187): here too, in the light of Eg. smk (hair determinative) „mit langer Locke (?)” (PT, Wb IV 144, 2), the third radical was apparently a root complement (indicator of a nominal class of the anatomical terminology as in Eg. gm3?) attached to a PEG. biconsonantal *sm, cf. HECu. *samm-o „top of head” [Hds. 1989, 420] || WCh.: Angas-Sura *soyom ~ *seyem (var. *šyēm in Mushere and Tal) „horn” [GT 2004, 337] | Bokkos šôm and Daffo-Butura šôm „Horn” [Jng. 1970, 390]. Thinking of the widely known history of IE * $\sqrt{k}r$ -, one is disposed to assume an ultimate etymological connection with Sem. * $\sqrt{šm}y$ > MSA: Mehri šôməy and EJibbali šūy „fine hair shed by camel” [Jns.

²⁵ An AA root variety with an original *g- is attested in Sem.: MSA *gVmgVm- „head” [GT, cf. Lsl. 1945, 234].

²⁶ Misrendered as „forehead” or „crown of the head”, it was erroneously affiliated by W.F. Albright (1918, 254, #127) and A. Ember (1926, 306, fn. 8; ESS §10.b.4 and §14.c.3) with Ar. ġabh-at- and Hbr. gabbāḥat „baldness on the front part of the head”.

²⁷ Attested in Mubi gúúmí (f), pl. góómám „Wange” [Lks. 1937, 182] = gùúmí (f), pl. gòomàm „1. joues, 2. tempe” [Jng. 1990 MS, 20], Kajakse gúggùm [< *gumgum] „joue” [Alio 2004, 243, #145], Kofa gúmè (f), pl. gúmmán „cheeks” [Jng. 1977 MS, 3, #7].

²⁸ Following C.T. Hodge, W.W. Müller (1975, 68, #55), V. Blažek (1989 MS Om., 16), V. Orel and Stolbova (1992, 171).

²⁹ The Cu.-Om. forms were first combined with the Ar. root by A.B. Dolgopól'skij (1972, 201; 1973, 213). N. Skinner (1992, 347) affiliated Ch. *g-m- „beard” [NM 1966, 232] with Ethio-Sem. *gwVnça „cheek, chin” [Skn.] || SBrb.: Ahaggar tē-ğoumes-t [tā-ğumes-t] pommelte de la joue” [Fcd. 1951-2, 452] || WCh: Hausa kúmċi, pl. kúmmittáá „cheek” [Abr. 1962, 552].

1987, 395] || LECu.: Afar samm-o „pubic region” [Sasse] | HECu.: Burji šómi „pubic hair” [Sasse 1982, 174] = šóma [Hds. 1989, 219] || SCu.: PRift *seʔem- „hair” [Ehret]: WRift: Iraqw seʔemi „hair” [Ehret] = seʔeum, other sources seʔeuŋ „hair” [Flm.] | ERift: Qwadza saʔamayo „body and limb hair” [Ehret], Asa sémuŋ „head-, hairdress” [Flm.] = seʔemuk „hair, feathers” [Ehret] (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 350) || NOM. *sVm(m)- „hair” [Blz.]: Janjero soma „hair” [Flm.] = somā „head”, somma ~ sōma „hair” [Mkr. 1981, 201], Benesho som „hair, head” [Flm.] (SCu.-NOM.: Fleming 1969, 11) || PCh. *√s₁₋₂m „hair” [Dlg.] > WCh.: Hausa suma „touffe de cheveux d’une tête humain” [Pls.] = sùṁá „hair of the head” [Abr. 1962, 826] = suuma „short growth of hair on head” [Skn.] | Ngamo sòm „cheveux” [Pilszczikova 1958, 76] = sòm „hair” [Blz.], Tangale šayom „hair” [Pls.] = sayûm „beard” [Jng. 1991, 141] (WCh.: Pls. 1958, 76).³⁰ Shall we postulate perhaps AA *√smʔ ~ *√sʔm „1. top/crown of head, 2. hair” [GT] = *sumʔ- (?) [Blz.] = *si/umaʔ- [Orel]?³¹

Eg. m3^c „1. Schläfe (Mensch, Tier, Ort wo der Zopf sitzt), 2. Zopf” (MK, Wb II 24; Grapow 1954, 29; GHWb 318; WD III 49) = „certaine partie du corps humain, semblable des deux côtés, peut-être l’épaule, mais plutôt la joue” (Jéquier 1911, 64-65, §23) = „1. la tempe, 2. les boucles de cheveux de la tempe” (Lefèbvre 1952, 14, §13; Massart 1959, 233, §28; AL 79.1115) = „side of the head, temple of head” (FD 102; DCT 156: already in CT VII 184g, IV 58g; Walker 1996, 269).³² Other authors side with a rendering „side of the head”.³³ I have, however, pointed elsewhere (Takács 2004, 57, #346) to the possible connection SAgaw: Awngi ŋari [ŋ- < *m- reg.] „temple of head” [Lmb.] || LECu.: Oromo mall-a „guancia, gota” [da Thiene 1939, 234] || NOM.: Kaffa mallall-o/ō „tempie, osso temporale” [Crl. 1951, 471] = „Schläfe(nknochen)” [Lmb.], Shinasha (Bworo) mālal-á „temple of head” [Lmb.], Mocha māll-o „temple of head” [Lsl.], Kaffa male-to „faccia” [Cecchi apud Rn. 1888, 318] | Sheko māll-o „temple of head (Schläfe)” [Lmb.] (NOM.-Cu.: Lmb. 1987, 533, #6.b; 1993, 105; 1993, 353) || CCh.: Glavda úúmōla „cheek” [RB 1968, 96] | Mada mlom „tempe” [Barreteau-Brunet 2000, 185], Hurzo mūlā „cheeks” [Rsg. 1978, 223, #124] | Lane mbə̀lāŋ [mb- < *m- reg.] „côté, profil” [Scn. 1982, 314]. Since these parallels reflect merely AA *√ml „temple of head”

³⁰ Several authors (Mukarovsky, Dolgopol’skij, Blažek) extended this comparison also onto CCh.: Fali-Jilbu šimčîn, Fali-Muchella šimki, Fali-Bwagira šimkin „hair” | Banana šimità, Musey šimit „hair” (CCh.: Kraft 1981). They assumed a secondary š- < *š-, which is, in principle, possible. One would be tempted to identify the suffix -k with the C₃ root complement of Eg. smk „mit langer Locke (?)” (PT, Wb IV 144, 2). But the cognacy of the CCh. term (of a significantly different vocalism) with Eg. šntj „hair” (above) seems more likely at the moment.

³¹ Literature for this Afro-Asiatic root comparison: Dolgopolsky 1990, 215; Blažek 1989 MS Om., 15, #47 (MSA-Eg.-Cu.-Ch.); Mukarovsky 1989 MS, 3 (SCu.-NOM.-Ch.); Orel and Stolbova 1992, 170 (NOM.-Eg.-WCh.); Skinner 1992, 350 (WCh.-Cu.-Eg.); Orel 1995, 109, #135 (Ch.-Eg.-Cu.).

³² P. Lacau (1970, 53, #125) explained the phonetic value m3^c of the feather hieroglyph (originally „la plume de la tempe”) from Eg. m3^c „temple” as related to m3^c „côté, bord”.

³³ H. Grapow (1954, 29) renders it literally „die Seite des Kopfes” (so also Walker l.c.) assuming it to be etymologically related to Eg. m3^c „Ufer des Flußes” (MK, Wb, above). G. Jéquier (1911, 64-65, §23), in turn, followed by P. Lacau (1970, 53-54, §125) proposed a derivation from Eg. m3^c „côté, bord”.

[GT] (without any trace of a third radical -ʿ), one is disposed to assume in Eg. m3ʿ < *mlʿ an additional root extension *-ʿ of anatomical terms (attested in East Cushitic).

Eg. ssk3 „Schläfe, Locke” (BD, Wb IV 279, 1) has been equated by V. Orel and O. Stolbova (HSED #125) with Sem.: Akk. usukku ~ sukku „Schläfe, Oberteil der Wange” [AHW 1439], which, interestingly, yields a further case of an additional -3 in the Egyptian match for an Afro-Asiatic root denoting the „temple of head” (cf. Eg. gm3 and sm3 above), which one might only render as an additional root extension.

„Ear”

Eg. *jdn „Ohr: nur noch aus der Schreibung der folgenden Worte zu erschließen” (Wb I 154), cf., e.g., jdn „jem. vertreten” (Lit. MK-, Wb I 154, 1) written with an ear determinative/logogram. As J. Zeidler (1984, 43-44, §3.2) pointed out, this ear determinative (EG³ 455, F21) appears also in the writing of a number of words spelled jd (Wb I 151-2) without the -n, which led him to „eine teilphonographische Schreibung *jd nahelegen*” assuming that „das Kuhohr ... hat demzufolge als Phonogramm wohl in erster Linie Lautwert jd (sem. „s), der mit [akk.] uznu ... nichts zu tun hat”. If this were true, one might wonder whether the association of the ear sign with the phonetic value was due to Eg. jdj „taub sein” (OK-, Wb I 151, 13). Unfortunately, however, Zeidler ignored the paper by M. Gilula (1975, 251), where the word jdn „ear” was pointed out as a real word attested in CT VII 30k: jdn ggwj „attentive ear”.³⁴ This suggestion was later corroborated also by W. Vycichl (1985, 172, §1; 1990, 45), C.T. Hodge (1977, 933), and by R. van der Molen (in her DCT 62 referring even to Hbr. ʾozen „ear”) etc., who correctly maintain the widely known³⁵ equation with Sem. *ʾudn- „ear” [Frz. 1964, 255] = *Hədn- [Djk. 1970, 468] = *ʾūd(Ṣ)n- [Dlg. 1982, 36, #1; 1994, 271, #4].³⁶ The correspondence of Eg. d vs. Sem. *ḏ is rare, although attested. Moreover, strangely, also the Ugaritic reflex of this word displays -d- instead of the expected -ḏ-.³⁷ One might also ponder whether Eg. -d- is here due to an influence of Eg. jdj „to be deaf”,³⁸ which,

³⁴ The rendering of jdn gg „attentive ear” is not commonly accepted. R.O. Faulkner (AECT III 18, spell 829), for instance, interprets this place as „he who was deaf (?) and who stared”. P. Barguet (1986, 556, spell 829), in turn, has here „celui qui remplace celui qui regarde (?)”, whereas R. Hannig (ÄWb II 455b) supposed here the occurrence of jdn „vertreten”.

³⁵ Erman 1892, 108 (after Brugsch and Steindorff); Ember 1911, 92; Holma 1911, x; Wb I 154; Albright 1927, 208, fn. 8; ESS §4.a.2 and §26.c.2; GÄSW 51, #128; Cohen 1947, #16; Vycichl 1953, 43; 1953, 112-113; Hodge 1981, 234. Note that N. Skinner’s (1992, 348; 1995, 30) comparanda (namely Brb. *udm „face”, Eg. wšm „ear of grain”, SCu.: Qwadza wat-o „ear” < AA *√wḡ/ḡm „ear”) cannot be accepted for phonological reasons.

³⁶ For Sem. cf. e.g. Leslau 1945, 233; Rabin 1975, 87, #21. n.

³⁷ Cf. Ug. ʾudn „Ohr” [WUS 8, #89] = ʾdn „ear” [DUL 20].

³⁸ The etymology of Eg. jdj is still obscure – unless it directly originates (via semantic opposition) from AA *√wḡ „to hear” [GT]. A.B. Dolgopolskij (1966, 70, #5.7) rightly found its equation with Agaw *ded- „deaf” [GT] || ECu. *dūd- „dumb, deaf” [Sasse 1982, 58-59] little convincing as he regarded PCu. *ṽd as an onomatopoeic root. Equally untenable is P. Lacau’s (1954, 300, n. 1) direct derivation from Eg. *jdn via the erosion of its final -n:

besides, C.T. Hodge (1976, 12, #37) even directly affiliated with the Eg.-Sem. isogloss $\sqrt{d}n$ for „ear”, outside which no evident cognates are found with this trilateral root structure.³⁹ The Russian scholars, headed by I.M. Diakonoff (1981, 27, fn. 9; 1986, 47), and their followers⁴⁰ isolated the third radical in Eg. and Sem. as a nomen instr./loci attached to an AA root $\sqrt{w}ž$ „to hear”. Also A.B. Dolgopolsky (1994, 271, #4) speaks of a „nominal suffix” here. This supposition has, however, no evidence on the Egyptian side.

Eg. msdr „Ohr” (PT, Wb II 154, 13-16): its derivation as the m- prefix *nomen loci* form of Eg. sdr „die Nacht zubringen, schlafen, liegen” (PT, Wb IV 390-2) has been widely accepted.⁴¹ This view has been expressed by most of the authors in the field of Eg. linguistics.⁴² The alternative comparison of Eg. msdr with common Brb. $\sqrt{m}zg$ „ear” [GT] (first established by Rochemonteix) is almost as old as its derivation from Eg. sdr and has also been maintained by numerous specialists.⁴³ Accepting the Brb. parallel of Eg. msdr, Ch. Rabin surmised the Eg. final -r to be an additional element that „occurs occasionally in HS as a suffix, cf. Hbr. -l”. But no such suffix -r has otherwise been observed in Egyptian – to the best of my knowledge. Another way of explaining the 4th Eg. -r would be assuming a secondary popular etymology of the Middle Kingdom: our word was still written in the Old Kingdom solely as msd, which was perhaps no longer

„il passe à ?i ou i qui ne s'est conservé que dans jdi 'être sourd'; l'infirmité exprimée par le radical du membre infirme”.

³⁹ W.W. Müller (1975, 64, #5), followed by A. Militarev and O. Stolbova (1990, 66) and HSED #126, compared the Sem. word with WCh.: Karekare dēngei || ECh.: Jegu ʔúdúgē „Ohr”. But the ECh. comparanda are not even with one another interrelated. On the one hand, Mubi-Toram *ʔuduŋ- „ear” [GT] > Jegu ʔúdúgē, pl. ʔúdáj „Ohr” [Jng. 1961, 117], Birgit ʔúdúgē (f), pl. ʔúdúgà [Jng. 2004, 359] might well be in fact a late Ar. borrowing, whereas, on the other hand, H. Jungrathmayr and D. Ibrizimow (1994 I 53C) were disposed to compare ECh.: Dangla dēngei, dēngjīko [Lks.] = dēngé [Fédry] (ECh. data: JI 1994 II 115) with PCu. *sVg(g)- „to hear” [Dlg. 1973].

⁴⁰ I.M. Diakonoff (1981, 27, fn. 9; 1984, 7), A. Militarev and O. Stolbova (1990, 66), V. Orel and Stolbova (1992, 170), Dolgopolsky (1973, 187-8, 301; 1994, 271, #4), followed by V. Blažek (1989 MS, 11, #28) and C.T. Hodge (1990, 647, #23.C), assumed an etymological connection to Cu.-Om. *waž(i)- [Djk.] = *wVž[ž]- [Dlg. 1973, 187-8, 301] > Agaw *was- „to hear” [Apl. 1984, 44] || NOm. *wayz-/H^wayz- „ear” [Blz.] = *ʔwāž- [OS] = *wayž- [Dlg.]. Note that neither F. Hintze's (1951, 77) PCu.-Om. *was- nor M.L. Bender's (1988, 146) Om. *way „ear” can be accepted regarding the fact that the Omotic reflexes are indicating an *-ž-.

⁴¹ The original sense of Eg. msdr has been rendered as „la partie de la tête sur laquelle on s'appuie pour dormir” (Lacau) = „endroit où l'on dort” (Vycichl: „it is on the ear that one sleeps”) = „место, на котором спят” (Ol'derogge) = „l'endroit sur lequel on dort” (Vergote) = „Stelle bzw. Vorrichtung zum Schlafen” > „Schläfe” (Osing) = „thing lain upon” (Smith) = „Schlafort” > „Schläfe” (Till: cf. German leg dich aufs Ohr! ≈ schlaf!) = „Schlafstelle” (Schenkel).

⁴² Müller 1909, 194, fn. 4 (with doubts); Grapow 1914, 31; 1954, 31; Cohen 1947, #82; Lacau 1954, 91; 1970, 37; 1970, 52, #119; 1972, 311, §31.A; AÄG 109, §253; Till 1955, 327, §18; Ol'derogge 1956, 7; Fecht 1960, 180, §373; Kaplony 1966, 91; D'jakonov 1967, 208; Rössler 1966, 228; Vergote 1973 Ib, 156; NBÄ 119, 588, n. 517; Smith 1979, 161; Vycichl 1983, 132; 1991, 122; Schenkel 1999, 90.

⁴³ Literature for the Eg.-Brb. etymology: Stern 1883, 26, fn. 2; Hommel 1893, 112; Bates 1914, 82; Lacau 1954, 300; 1970, 52, #120; 1972, 311, §31.A, fn. 4; Bender 1975, 160; KHW 113; Rabin 1977, 336, fn. 33; Rössler 1987, 384. Rejected by A.Ju. Militarev (2005, 359, #21) for the sake of an evidently false etymology.

understood as something resembling a noun deducible from a „native” triconsonantal verbal root, while the derivation from Eg. *sḏr* „to lie (down)” was maybe at hand and this commonly conceivable reinterpretation led to a new form *msḏr*. If the underlying PBrb. root contained *-g as supposed by M. Cohen, C. Brockelmann, P. Lacau, and A.Ju. Militarev (cf. below),⁴⁴ the equation of this hypothetical OEg. **msḏ* and PBrb. **√mzg* might be in principle established by the shift of AA **ç/č/ĉ*- + *g > pre-Eg. *s- + *-g- > Eg. s- + -ḏ- (loss of glottalization due to incompatibility, cf. EDE I 327-9). Does the Eg.-Brb. isogloss represent the *nomen instrumenti* of PAA **čug*- „to hear” [Mlt.] = **√čg* [GT]?

Eg. **nh.wj* „die zwei Ohren (als Körperteil des Menschen)” (MK, Wb I 204-5): its root, *√nh* (which has no reasonable verbal source in Eg.)⁴⁵ may well be derived from AA **√nQ* ~ **√nQ* (with an epenthetic nasal) „to listen, hear” [GT], which is only attested in Cushitic⁴⁶ and Chadic⁴⁷, but – again – not in Semitic. The Eg.-Cu. (*sine* SCu.) etymology has been known since the article by E. Zyhlarz (1932-33, 166).⁴⁸ All this makes us assume here an „African” Eg. word **nh* „ear” synonymous to the long extinct „Semitic” Eg. **jdn* „ear”.

„Eye”

Eg. **ʿn* (act. ***ʿjn*) „Auge (nur im Schriftzeichen erhalten)” (Wb I 189): a „prehistoric word” (Ember), or to put it in other words: „the value ʿn of a hieroglyph including an eye shows that Eg. earlier had ʿn (or ʿyn) for 'eye'” (Hodge 1976, 19, n. 36), whose

⁴⁴ The PBrb. root and noun stem have been reconstructed in various forms, e.g., as **√mzy* [Prv. 1911, 128; Rns. 1932, 386] = **√mzg* > dialectal vars. **√mzy* ~ **√mzk* [Cohen 1947, #82] = **√mzy* ~ **√mzy* [Rössler 1987, 384] vs. **a-mezzug* > **a-mezzuy* [Brk. 1932, 812] = **a-məzzuy*, pl. **i-məžž* (sic) [Basset 1929, 43-44 quoted also by Lacau 1970, 52, #120] = **a-mezzug* [Lacau 1954, 300] = *[t]a-məzzug > **a-məzzuy* ~ **a-məzzuk* and pl. **i/a-məžgi* > **a-məžž-i* ~ **m[əžž]-i* ~ **m[əžž]-i* [Mlt. 1991, 256] = **a-məzzuy* > vars. with *-zz- (influenced by *-y) [Blz. 1994, 434] = **a-məzzug* [Mlt. in Starostin et al. 1995 MS, 6] = **ta-mV-zug*-(t) [Mlt. 2005, 359, #21].

⁴⁵ In any case, an inner Egyptian derivation from *√nh* „to live” seems far-fetched and much less probable.

⁴⁶ Attested in (?) Bed. ʿángw'il [affix -il] „Ohr” [Rn.], Bisharin ʿankw'il „ear” [Almkvist] || Agaw *ʿəṇqʷ- „ear” [Apl. 2006, 59] || LECu.: Saho ʾokká, pl. ʾókāk „Ohr” [Rn. 1890, 23] = ʾokka [Bnd.] = ʾokka „ear” [Vergari 2003, 66], Saho-Assaorta ʾoqquá, pl. ʾoqqāq „orecchio” [CR] = ʾokkḡwā [Dlg.: ʿ- „записано ошибочно или вторично”], cf. Afar ʾókka „ear-wax (cérumen)” [PH 1985, 61] || (?) SCu. *ʾaḥw- (unexpected *ʾ- and *-h-) „to listen” [Ehret] „to hear” [GT]: WRift *ʾaḥ-as and *ʾaḥ-am-is „to hear”, *ʾaḥw-es (caus.) „to talk” (GT: lit. *, „to make s'one listen”) [Kießling-Mous 2004, 64] | Asa h-as- „to hear” [Ehret] | Dahalo ʾágazzo [affix -zgo] „ear” [Tosco 1991, 127] (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 288, #47). The SCu. stem may have originated in an earlier incompatible ***ʿaḥw*- (the sequence **√h* is unattested in SCu.). The Cushitic comparative data are from Cerulli 1938 II, 213; Dolgopol'skij 1973, 183 (with false reconstruction); Zaborski 1989, 580, #21; Ehret 1995, 521, #728.

⁴⁷ CCh.: PBura-Margi *ngV „to hear” [GT]: Bura ngga “hören”, ngga-ta “hören, fühlen, empfinden” [Hfm. in RK 1973, 93], Chibak ngá-ti “hören” [Hoffmann 1955, 135], Margi-Wamdiu nga-ri “to hear” [Kraft], WMargi ngə-di „to hear”, ngà-di „1. to hear, 2. feel” [Kraft] | Higi nga-rdi „entendre” [Kraft] (CCh.: Kraft 1981 quoted by Brt.-Jng. 1990, 77) || ECh.: Mokilko ʾənnigá „(se) taire” [Jng. 1990, 58].

⁴⁸ D. Appleyard's (l.c.) reluctance to accept this old Agaw-Egyptian etymology (i.e. the equation by Zyhlarz 1932-3, 166) – as “probably not related” – is not based on any exact argument.

equation with Sem. *^ʕayn- „eye”⁴⁹ has widely been accepted,⁵⁰ whereas this Eg.-Sem. word as a noun has only dubious attestation outside Sem.-Eg. Quite a lot of scholars⁵¹ preferred to equate the Eg.-Sem. isogloss with LECu.: i.a. Saho ʕintô ~ intô, pl. ôntit „Auge” [Rn. 1887, 41] = pl. ʕintît ~ intît [Dlg. allegedly < Rn.]⁵² || NOm.: Gimirra ʕan „eye” [Bulatovič] (Cu.-Om.: Dlg. 1973, 149-150) || PCh. *idə „eye” [Newman 1977, 26] = *-d- [NM 1966, 234, #28]. The ECh. forms, however, may well be due to an Arabic influence, whereas the reconstruction and external etymology of the Chadic word are hardly supporting any connection to Eg.-Sem. *^ʕayn-.⁵³ The suggestion by O.V. Stolbova on a simultaneous (!) comparison of the above Common Chadic noun for „eye” with her all too suggestive WCh. *^ʕayan- „видеть, глаз” [Stl. 1987] = *ʕayan- „to see” [OS] with a forged *^ʕ-⁵⁴ is certainly out of question as its reflexes certainly represent a different verbal root, presumably AA *^ʕh/γyn „to see” [GT],⁵⁵ whereas, nevertheless, we may isolate a remotely related PAA root variety *^ʕyn „to see” [GT], which, in turn, may have been the verbal root to Eg.-Sem. *^ʕayn-, cf. SCu.: Dahalo ʕēn-āḏ- (with refl. suffix -āḏ-) „to see from afar” [Ehret 1980, 274] || WCh.: Geji yenî „to see” [Smz.], Tule ya:ni „to see” [Smz.] | Bole ʕinn- „sehen, meinen” [Lks. 1971, 133] (WCh.: JI 1994 II, 284) || ECh.: Jegu ʕinn- „wissen” [Jng. 1961, 113]. In any case, Eg. *^ʕn as a noun has a match only in Semitic.

Eg. jr.t „Auge” (OK-, Wb I 106-7), act. *jîr.et „occhio” (Farina 1926, 23) = *jîr.ṯ [GT] reflected in Greek letters as ἰῶτ and in Coptic as (L) **ⲓⲉⲣⲉ**, (SA) **ⲉⲓⲉⲣ-**, (BF) **ⲓⲉⲣ-**,⁵⁶ *jîr.t= (GT) > (S) **ⲉⲓⲁ(ⲗ)ⲧ**= etc. „Auge” (KHW 51-52): the research has always

⁴⁹ For the Sem. reflexes see, for instance, Leslau 1945, 233; Rabin 1975, 67, #25.

⁵⁰ See Hommel 1883, 440, fn. 30; Erman 1892, 108; Holma 1911, x; Ember 1918, 30; Wb I 189; ESS §11.a.6; GÄSW #136; Vycichl 1958, 372, 381; Hodge 1976, 12, #36; HSED #1084.

⁵¹ See Müller 1896, 210-211; Meinhof 1912, 232; Trombetti 1923, 113; Cohen 1947, #63; Wölfel 1955, 42; Greenberg 1963, 56, #29; Dolgopolsky 1964, 59; 1982, 37, #5; 1994, 274-5, #5; Stolbova 1977, 64; 1987, 228; Skinner 1987, 74-77; Lamberti 1987, 534, #13; OS 1992, 170.

⁵² The reconstruction of an ECu. **^ʕin- on the basis of its attested pl. *^ʕin-tV „eye” [Dlg.] is but hypothetical, since all other ECu. reflexes show not even the trace of ^ʕ-.

⁵³ The hypothetic PCh. *HindV [Dlg.] > WCh. *ʕindV „глаз” [Stl. 1977] are far-fetched, since the overwhelming bulk of the Chadic reflexes (except for Gwandara, Pero, and Dghwede, for further possible CCh. forms supporting the reconstruction of Ch. *^ʕynd see Mkr. 1989 MS, 2) do not show any trace of the (anyway secondary epenthetic?) nasal C₂ element and speak for *yid- fitting much better an equation with Sem. *^ʕyd^ʕ „to know”.

⁵⁴ Already A.Ju. Militarev (1991, 258, #25.1) convincingly separated the Sem.-Cu. stem from Stolbova’s artificial WCh. *^ʕind- whose reconstruction „не вытекает из самого ... материала”.

⁵⁵ Cf. WCh.: Hausa gáníf [g- regular < *γ- and not *^ʕ-], „1. to see, 2. look at, 3. consider, 4. get”, gáánè „to understand, realize”, gánóó „to see from afar” [Abr. 1962, 296, 298, 301] = gani „видеть” [Old. 1954, 127] | NBauchi *han- (or *h^ʕan-?) [Skn.]: Pa’a hân (pf.), haníf (aor.), hânó (impf.), „to see repeatedly, keep on seeing” [MSkn. 1979, 181] = han „to see” [Skn. 1977, 38] = hani „to see” [IL] || (?) Eg. hn (eye det.) „etw. ansehen” (GR, Wb III 104, 7).

⁵⁶ Cf. (SA) **ⲉⲓⲉⲣⲃⲟⲟⲛⲉ**, (B) **ⲉⲓⲉⲣⲃⲟⲛⲓ**, (F) **ⲉⲓⲉⲣⲃⲁⲛⲓ** „böser Blick”, adj. „neidisch” < Eg. jr.t bjn.t „bad eye” (KHW 25).

been divided in two groups concerning its origin, although, phonologically, neither of these solutions is perfectly satisfying:

(1) As a noun, it could be *prima vista* neatly identified with NBrb. *allen, the pl. of sg. *titt [- < **t-il-t?] „eye” [Zhl.]⁵⁷ || Agaw *ʕall- „eye” [Dlg. pace Apl. 1984, 57] = *[ʕ]il- [Apl. 1991, 20, 23] || ECu. *ʔil- „eye” and denom. *ʔilāl- „to look at” [Sasse 1979, 5, 22, 1982, 104-5] || SCu. *ʔila „eye” and (denom.?) *ʔiley- „to know” [Ehret 1980, 291-2].⁵⁸ Here, however attractive this comparison may seem, neither of the root consonants in fact corresponds: Eg. j- (here, „real” *y-) ≠ AA *ʔ-, whereas Eg. -r- (here, in fact, „real” *-r-) ≠ AA *-l-.

(2) As a verbal root of dubious existence, the supposedly underlying Eg. *jrj „sehen”⁵⁹ might be affiliated with Bed. iray „wissen, erfahren” [Rn. 1895, 30] || ECu.: Dullay *ʔar- „to know” [Orel] || SCu. *ʔar- „to (fore)see” [Ehret 1980, 286] || NOm. *ar- „to know” [Bender 1988, 147] (Cu.-Om.: Fleming 1969, 22, Dlg. 1973, 170-1; Bender 1988, 155; Zaborski 1989, 587-8; HSED #75; Orel 1995, 119). This etymology, however, does not take into account that Eg. j- is reflecting here a „real” *y-, not a glottal stop as the Coptic reflexes evidently indicate. Many authors are inclined to equate Eg. jr.t with Sem. *ʕrʔy (met.?) „to see”.⁶⁰ Equally ambiguous is others’ suggestion to affiliate Eg. jr.t with some sporadic Chadic forms for „eye” like ir (and sim.).⁶¹ Some authors even confused these diverse roots.⁶²

Eg. b33 „pupil of eye” (MK Mag. 2x, Roccati) = „eyeball” (Ward 1978, 141) → bnr [*bl] „ball of eye” (NE, CED 22) = „balls (of eyes)” (DLE I 156) = „Augapfel, Auge” (GHWb 254)⁶³ → br.wj „eyes” (GR, Wb I 465, 5) → Dem. bl „eye” (DG 120)

⁵⁷ For an alternative etymology of the Brb. sg. form see Basset 1887, 458; Gouffé 1974, 361, Militarev 1991, 258, #25.1. The comparison of Eg. jr.t and Brb. sg. tiss was declined by P. Lacau (1954, 300).

⁵⁸ Müller 1896, 210 (sine Eg.); Meinhof 1912, 232, Zyhlarz 1932-3, 88; GÄSW 120, #501; Cohen 1947, #63; Wölfel 1955, 42; Greenberg 1963, 56, #29; Dolgopolsky 1964, 59, 1987, 199, #32; 1994, 276-277, #5(B); D’jakonov 1965, 41; 1974, 742; Fleming 1969, 24; Zaborski 1989, 581, #24; Militarev 1991, 258, #25.2, OS 1992, 170; Blažek 1992, 153; 1994, 102, 1994 MS Elam, 3.

⁵⁹ Allegedly attested by the Eg. imperative jrj tw „pass auf, gib acht!” (OK-NE, Wb I 108, 4) and jr „das Sehen (als Personifikation neben sdm ‘das Hören’)” (XVIII., Wb I 108, 3). Cf. Zeidler 1984, 44, n. 35.

⁶⁰ Ember 1912, 89, fn. 1 and 92; 1926, 301, fn. 10; ESS §12.a.2; Hodge 1968, 26 (including Ch. *l- “to see”); Vycichl 1975, 203, Zeidler 1984, 44, n. 35; Bomhard 1986, 249; Hodge 1990, 646, §10.B.

⁶¹ See Greenberg 1963, 56, #29; Dolgopolsky 1964, 59; OS 1990, 90, #47; 1992, 185; HSED #112. We are dealing here, however, with rhotacism (-r < *d-), cf. WCh.: Bole-Tangale *ido “eye” [Schuh 1984, 208] < Ch. *d- “eye” [NM 1966, 234, #29] = *idə [Newman 1977, 26 followed by Tourneux 1990, 253].

⁶² Dolgopolsky 1964, 59; Mukarovsky 1966, 17; 1995, 71; Fleming 1966, 24; Otto in LÄ I 560, “Auge”, n. 1; Skinner 1987, 75-76; 1995, 31; Belova 1991, 89; 1993, 54.

⁶³ Already J. Černý (CED 22) and W.A. Ward (1978, 143-144; 1996, 43, fn. 6) explained (SB) βαλ from LEg. bnr, which Ward ultimately related to PT 432a b33, whose meaning is, however, disputed: „hole” (Sethe in ÜKAPT) = „eyeball” (Faulkner in AEPT 87, followed by Ward 1978, 142) = „hole-inhabitant” (Borghouts 1971, 101) = „Pupille” (GHWb 240). The shift of OK b33 [act. *bil] → LEg. bnr (suggested by Ward) is in theory possible. For the „reappearance” of *l as LEg. -nr < OEg. -3, cf. MEg. -3 > NEg. -nr [act. *-l] „o daß doch” (Wb III 11). Because of semantical considerations, one would be, however, disposed to distinguish between GR br + PCpt. *bal „eye” vs. LEg. bnr + OEg. b33 „ball of eye”. W. Vycichl (1951, 71; 1955, 314, fn. 12) supposed

→ Cpt. (SB) βαλ, (ALFO) בעל „eye” (CD 31b; CED 22; KHW 22): in this case, the word for „eye” apparently developed semantically *pars pro toto* from a basic sense „ball”, so it is presumably to be regarded as an inner Egyptian innovation. This is why the resemblance of Eg. br „sehen, erblicken” (GR, Wb I 465, 6), evidently a denominal derivative from the same root, to the reflexes of AA *√bl „to look at” [GT],⁶⁴ with which the GR word has been usually equated,⁶⁵ may be due to pure chance. The same may well pertain to Meroitic *bel „eye” [Zhl. 1956, 25].⁶⁶ In any case, our Eg. word may have been a native innovation and not an inherited item of the common Eg.-Sem. anatomical terminology.

Eg. mr.t „Auge (einer Gottheit)”, dual mr.tj „die beiden Augen” (BD 1x, GR frequently, Wb II 107, 10-15) = „l’oeil (du dieu)”, dual „les deux yeux” (Lefébvre 1952, 16, §17; El-Sayed 1987, 64) = „Auge des Königs” (Edfu, Kurth 1994, 13, §52).⁶⁷ W. Helck (1954, 76-77), followed by A. Volten (1959, 27), demonstrated the early existence of the word attested by an unusual writing (m + two eye signs) of the title mr „Vorsteher” (Wb) from Dyn. III on. If this is correct, we have here the fourth old Egyptian term for „eye”. Etymology disputed:

(1) In the view of W. Vycichl (1951, 72) and G. Takács (1995, 159), this is ultimately cognate with Eg. m33 „to see” (with an interchange of 3 ~ r). Cf. also LEg. m3.tj dual. „die Augen (Sonne und Mond als Augen des Himmels)” (LP, Wb II 11).

(2) P. Lacau (1970, 150, §406) derived it via m- prefix from Eg. jr.t „eye”, which was approved by W.A. Ward (1978, 144-6, §287): „*attractive suggestion and would strengthen the idea of a late dialectal variant*” (specific for the Ptolemaic lexicon). Unconvincing. None of the functions of m- seems to fit here.

(3) W. Westendorf (KHW 22) and W. Guglielmi (1991, 16 & fn. 92 with lit.) suggested a connection between Eg. mr.t ~ OEg. b33 > NEg. bnr > GR br.wj (dual) „eye(ball)”,

the trace of an OEg. *b3.t „eye” in the toponym of modern Ar. Hurbeyt < Cpt. (B) Φαρβαϊτ < Φαρβαῖθος < LEg. *p3-ḥr-b3.tj [*p-ḥar-baitē/*-bi3taj] „Horus mit den beiden Augen”. More recently, however, A. Czapkiewicz (1971, 20, #23) rendered Hurbeyt as *pr-ḥr-j3btj „the eastern residence of Horus”. Others derived Ar. Horbeit ~ Horbēt from the Eg. toponym pr-ḥr-mr.tj, lit. „Haus des Horus der beiden Augen” (KHW 479; PL 446). G. Roeder (ZÄS 61, 1926, 58) was sceptical about this derivation (esp. as for LEg. ḥ- > Ar. h- and Gk. -βαθ- < Eg. mr.tj), but K. Sethe (1928, 99) collected evidence for Eg. ḥ- > Ar. h- and LEg. m > Gk. β.

⁶⁴ Sem.: Ar. √blw I „examiner, essayer, éprouver” [BK I 164-165] = III „to pay attention to” [SISAJa I, #50; HCVA I 22, #50; Belova 1995, 32] || LECu.: Saho bal- „sehen, erblicken” [Rn. 1890, 78], Saho-Irob bala „to see” [Rn. 1878, 137], Afar bal- „sehen, unterscheiden”, bäl-ä „Spion” [Rn. 1886, 828] = -bal/-bl- „to see” [Bliese 1976] = -bl- „to see” [Sasse quoted by Blažek] = uble „to see, perceive, feel, understand” [PH 1985, 159] | HECu.: Sidamo bolli y- „to stare” [Hds. 1989, 354: isolated in HECu.] || WCh.: Goemay pil [p < *b reg.] „to look at sg. carefully, inspect” [Srl. 1937, 181] | (?) Tangale balj (originally causative?) „to show, exhibit, display, explain, reveal” [Jng. 1991, 70] || CCh.: (?) Margi ḥə̀lā [ḥ- obscure] „to watch, guard” [Reutt-Kogan 1973, 107].

⁶⁵ For the LECu.-LEg. comparison see Reinisch 1885, 98; Rössler 1971, 312; Hodge 1990, 171 (also a number of unrelated *comparanda*); Blažek 1994 MS Bed., 24.

⁶⁶ Note that the Meroitic reconstructions by E. Zyhlarz are outdated and are usually unreliable.

⁶⁷ Occurs esp. in the epithet of Horus of Pharaithos ḥr-mr.tj.

which was rightly declined by W.A. Ward (1978, 144-145, §287). There was probably no etymological relationship to Eg. *bl (cf. EDE II s.v. br).

„Nose”

Eg. fnd „Nase” (OK, Wb I 577, 10-15): its etymology has not yet been unambiguously settled. In any case, most probable seems a Semitic connection (solution 1 below):

(1) It has often been equated with ES: Amharic and Argobba afənča „nose”, Tigrinya ʔäfənča „nose” (ES: Leslau 1949, 48).⁶⁸ Phonologically, it would be plausible, but the etymology of the Ethio-Semitic word is also heavily debated.⁶⁹

(2) Frequently affiliated⁷⁰ also with the derivatives of AA *√fn (perhaps *fun-) „nose” [GT]⁷¹ and the underlying verbal root, PAA *√fn „1. to blow, breathe, 2. smell” [GT],⁷²

⁶⁸ For this Eg.-ES comparison see Ember 1917, 21; Albright 1918, 98, fn. 1; Cohen 1947, #35; Dolgopolskij 1966, 59, #2.5; MM 1983, 217-218; Militarev 1987, 102, #4; HCVA I #62.

⁶⁹ A.B. Dolgopolskij (1966, 59): borrowed from PCu. *fVn- “nose”. D. Appleyard (1977, 11/53): metathesis of *anəf- < Sem. *ʔanp- „nose” + suffix -əčča. M. Lamberti (1987, 533) derived it from a hypothetical *af-n-s- < PCu. *asun-đa „nose” assuming an „Oromoid” change of -f- < *s- in Amharic (!). A.Ju. Militarev (1987, 102, #4, cf. HCVA I #62): directly < PAA *fVn „1. nose, 2. to smell” + „old suffixed formant” (function not explained) both in ES and Eg. In my opinion, SCu.: Dahalo fun- [t regular < AA *ç] „to breathe” [EEN 1989, 23; Tosco 1991, 133] might perhaps reflect AA *√fnç „to breathe” [GT], whence both ES *√fnç and Eg. fnd eventually derived. The Dahalo-Eg. comparison was first suggested by Ch. Ehret (1997 MS, 35, #1157).

⁷⁰ For this etymology see Meinhof 1912, 237; Cohen 1947, #35; D’jakonov 1965, 40; Dolgopolskij 1966, 59, #2.5; 1970, 625, #109; 1973, 45; Bender 1975, 179; SISAJa I 125, #156; MM 1983, 217-218; Lamberti 1987, 533; Militarev 1987, 102, #4; Zaborski 1989, 586; HCVA I #62; HSED #802; Ehret 1997 MS, 35, #1157.

⁷¹ Cf. Sem.: Geez fanna ~ fanana „to cut off the end of the nose” [Lsl. 1987, 162], Amharic funno “one with a broad flattened nose” [HCVA] ||| Brb. *a-funfan „muzzle” [GT] > NBrb.: Shilh a-funfan “nose” [Bnd.] | Mzab ffunfan „1. être enchifrené (nez), enrhumé du cerveau” [Dlh. 1984, 49] || SBrb.: Ahaggar ā-funfan, pl. i-funfan-en „1. musée, 2. mufle, 3. nez (d’animal)” [Fcd. 1951-2, 331], ETawllemmet i-fūfan-ən „neseau” [Ncl. 1957, 61] = (also in Ayr) a-fənfan „musée, nez d’animal” [PAM 1998, 63] ||| LECu.: (?) Oromo fuñan „nose” [Rn. 1887, 122] = fuññan [Gragg 1982, 150] = funnan ~ fuññan [Lmb.] = fuñan [Foot & Tutschek] = fuñani [Vitterbo] = fuññan [Ali-Zbr. 1990, 135], Borana dial. fūnnāni „nose” [Andrzejewski & Sasse] ||| NOM.: Haruro punnān-ā „tromba” [CR 1937, 657]. Note that the etymology of Oromo word is problematic. H.-J. Sasse (1982, 169) and M. Lamberti (1987, 533) derived it from ECu. *sVn- „nose” (with a regular change of Oromo f- < ECu. *s-). But others (Meinhof 1912, 237; Dolgopolskij 1966, 59; Bender 1975, 177; SISAJa I 125, #156; MM 1983, 217-218; Militarev 1987, 102, #4; HCVA I #62) insisted on that Oromo f- reflects here an original ECu. *f- (also possible). V.É. Orel and O.V. Stolbova (HSED #832) are gravely mistaken reconstructing a non-existing LECu. *fung- (!) from Oromo „nose”. Areal parallels: PWNigr. *p-húna „nose” [Smz. 1981, 17, #103], PBantu *p-ùndò „nose” [Gtr. 1971, 137]. Already L. Homburger (1929, 168) compared Eg. fnd to Bantu (sic) pula ~ puno „nose”.

⁷² Preserved in Bed. fin „1. schnüffeln, nach Geruch in der Luft fangen (das Wildtier), riechen, schnuppen, 2. sich ausschnaufen, ausruhen, Rast machen”, fin „Geruch” [Rn. 1895, 79] || NAgaw: Bilin fun y „schnüffeln, nach Geruch in der Luft fangen (das Wild wenn es Witterung erhält), schnuppen” [Rn. 1887, 122] || LECu.: Oromo fumfaða „riecken schnüffeln, schnaufen” [Rn.] ||| NOM.: NWometo *punn-is „to blow” [GT]: Wolayta fun „soffiare il fuoco” [Crl. 1929, 29] = punn-is „to blow” [Alm.], Dorze punn-ires „to blow” [Alm.], Dawro-Kullo fun-edda „to blow” [Alm.] (NWometo: Alemayehu 1993, 4) | Haruro (Kachama) pe:no „to smell” [Sbr. 1994, 20] || Som.: Ari fen-a „lung” [Bnd. 1994, 154] ||| WCh.: Bole-Tangale *√fnt (root extension *-t-) „to blow on” [GT] = *fəntu [Schuh]: Karekare fUntu-, Bole fintú-, Ngamo flnt-, Dera pindé (Bole-Tangale: Schuh 1984,

which does not explain the third Eg. radical unless we assume here a marker *-d* occurring in certain Egyptian body part names.⁷³

(3) Others⁷⁴ supposed Eg. *fn̄d* to be a metathesis of **dn̄f* < ***gn̄f*⁷⁵ and equated it with Bed. *genúf* ~ *ginúf*, pl. *geníf* „nose” [Rpr. 1928, 186] = *genúf*, pl. *geníf* „Nase, Schnabel” [Rn. 1895, 98], which is, however, related to Agaw **g^wəmb-* „nose, mouth” [Apl.]⁷⁶ and their AA background is still unclear.⁷⁷

Eg. šr.t „Nase” (PT-, Wb IV 523-4) is, as pointed out already by E. Zyhlarz (1934, 111 and fn. 2), followed by N. Skinner (1992, 353), akin to Brb. **ti-nzar-t* „nose” [GT].⁷⁸ The underlying Brb. **√n̄zr* may contain a root extension **n-*, while it is lacking in Egyptian just like in the case of Eg. *dr̄t* „hand” akin to CCh. **√ngr*

215) | Ngizim *fāunú* „to smell, sniff at” [Schuh 1981, 57] || CCh.: Bura *ferar* [*r* < **n*] „to blow with the breath” [BED 1953, 67] | Pus *fini* „se moucher” [Trn. 1991, 88], Vulum (Mulwi) *-fíngí, -fínj* „se moucher” [Trn. 1978, 293], Mbara *fègè* „se moucher” [TSL 1986, 196, 260, 294] | Masa *fōna* „to blow” [Jng. in JI 1994 II, 33] || ECh.: Lele *pīny-* „1. souffler avec la bouche, 2. vanner” [WP 1982, 76] | WDangla *pànè* „jouer d’un instrument à vent” [Fédry 1971, 53], EDangla *páné* „1. jouer d’un instrument à vent, 2. souffler dans” [Dbr.-Mnt. 1973, 236] = *páné* „ein Blasinstrument spielen” [Ebs. 1979, 133; 1987, 94].

⁷³ Nearly all of these examples are dubious: (1) Eg. *psd* „Rücken, Rückgrat” (OK, Wb I 556) = „back, spine” (FD 95) < AA **√ps* „back” [GT]: NOm.: Haruro *pes-o* ~ *pis-o* „deretano” [CR 1937, 657] ||l WCh.: Hausa *fāṣà* „to postpone beginning sg.” [Abr. 1962, 257] || CCh.: Logone *páse* „Gesäß, Hinterer” [Lks. 1936, 115] = *mpáse* „cul” [Mch. 1950, 32]. (2) Eg. *mnd* „Brust” (OK, Wb II 92-93): with respect to the etymology presented by G. Takács (1997, 232, #22), *-d* must have belonged to the root. Probably unrelated to SCu.: Burunge *mūna* „chest (physic.)” [Wtl. 1958, 22, #16] = *muna’i* „chest” [Ehret 1980, 159] ||l CCh.: Tera *mémónà* „chest” [Newman 1964, 38, #67]. (3) Eg. *mnd.t* „Teil des Gesichts: zwischen Nase und Jochbein längs dem Auge” (OK, Med., Wb II 93, 10) = „cheek” (FD 110) = „Wange, Backe” (GHWb 343) ||l ECu. **mīn-* „1. forehead, 2. face” [GT] (ECu.: Lmb. 1987, 533) ||l WCh.: Butura *mān* „forehead” [Magwa etc. 1985, 15] || CCh.: Hina *manénò* „Stirn” [Str. 1922-1923, 113]. For ECu.-Hina see Blažek 2000, 182-183, #7. (4) Eg. *nh̄d.t* „Zahn” (OK, Wb II 304): origin obscure. (5) Eg. *hnd* „Teil vom Vorderschenkel des Rindes als Speise” (PT, Wb III 314, 18) < (?) AA **√ql* „thigh” [GT]: Sem.: Akk. *ḫallu* (*a/ḫB*, *nA*) „Oberschenkel” [AHW 312] ||l WCh.: Pero *kpél* [**k^wel*] „thigh” [Frj. 1985, 38].

⁷⁴ For the Eg.-Bed.-Agaw comparison see Behnk 1928, 139, #26; Zyhlarz 1932-33, 173; Vycichl 1933, 174, fn. 1; 1934, 63; 1938, 133; 1960, 263; 1990, 22; Cohen 1947, #35; Bender 1975, 179; Trombetti 1977, 349; Blazek 1994 MS Bed., 16.

⁷⁵ Cp. also the nose determinative in Eg. *gn̄f* „abweisen” (MK, Wb V 174), which may perhaps speak for a once **gn̄f* „nose”.

⁷⁶ Cf. NAgaw: Bilin *q^wəmba* [Apl.] = *q^wnbā* ~ *q^wmbā* [Mnh.] = *k^wnbā*, pl. *kunfēf* [Trombetti], Kemant *ḥ^wəmba* [Apl.], Qwara *humbā* ~ *komba* [Trombetti] | SAgaw: Awngi *kumbi* [Trombetti] = *ḡəmbí* [Apl.] = *gimbí* [Zbr.] (Agaw: Apl. 1984, 38) || LECu.: Oromo *humbi* „Rüssel” [Mnh.] = *humbi* „nose” [Zbr.]. From Cushitic may have originated as a loan-word Amharic *kumbiya* „Rüssel des Elefanten” [Zbr.] (Cu.: Meinhof 1912, 237; Zaborski 1989, 586).

⁷⁷ A. Trombetti (1977, 349) compared the Bed.-Agaw word to Ar. *qunāf-, qināf-* „magno naso praeditus” excluding the comparison with Eg. ***gn̄f*. Ch. Ehret (1987, 88, #379) equated Bed. „nose” with SCu.: PRift **gamf-* „chin” [Ehret 1980, 364, #2] < PCu. **ganf-/g̃inf-* „nose”. Others (Haberland-Lamberti 1988, 119) analyzed the Bed.-Agaw stem as a compound of PCu. **gVn-* „nose” and **bar-* „front”, which is equally unconvincing.

⁷⁸ E. Zyhlarz (l.c.) quoted Tuareg (sic) *tī-nzer-t* „Nase”. For Brb. data see Basset 1883, 179, 298, 312; 1887, 421, 458.

„hand” [GT] (cf. below), whereas its *-z- is a regular correspondence of Eg. š- < AA *š- (Militarev 1991).⁷⁹ All other attempts at solving the etymology of Eg. š.r.t have remained vain.⁸⁰

„Tooth”

Eg. jbh „Zahn, besonders des Menschen, auch der Tiere, sogar Stoßzahn des Elefanten” (OK, Wb I 64, 2-4) > (S) **OB2E** „orig. Schneidezahn (?)” (KHW 137, fn. 7): origin obscure, all attempts until now have remained unconvincing.⁸¹ I only can put forward two weak, albeit plausible approaches:

(1) On the one hand, a basic meaning „white” and an etymological connection with Sem. *ḥalab- „milk” [Lsl. 1987, 229] are in principle not to be ruled out.

(2) On the other hand, the final -ḥ is suspicious as it used to occur in body parts’ names (Takács 1997). But I have been so far unable to find any external match for *jb „tooth”, which signifies the little chances of a non-Semitic etymology.

Eg. nḥd.t, younger (MK) **ndḥ.t** „Zahn” (OK-, Wb II 304, 5-8 and 384, 2-3) = „fang, tusk, canine tooth” (Walker 1996, 271) = „molar” (Borghouts 1999, 177) > (S) **Na(α)X2E**, **Na(α)XE**, (B) **NaX2I** etc. „orig. Reibezahn (?)” (KHW 137, also fn. 7):

⁷⁹ It is to be distinguished from WBrb.: Zenaga u-nžer “se moucher” [Bst. 1909, 247] < Brb. *√nsr “se moucher” [GT] III ECh.: Mubi ḡèsér “(se) moucher” [Jng. 1990 MS], distinct from Brb. *√nżr. The former might perhaps correspond to Eg. nz3 “to blow out (of one’s nose)” (CT III 100d, AEET I 159), which, however, R. van der Molen (DCT 245) considered to be merely a false writing for nf3.

⁸⁰ W.F. Albright (1918, 239) and A. Ember (ESS §12.a.39, cf. GÄSW 208, #860) combined Eg. š.r.t with Ar. ḥarra „to snore” and also nuḥr-at- „snout, tip of nose”, while N. Skinner (1992, 353) did it directly with Sem. *naḥir- „nostril”, cf. Akk. naḥēru „nostril”, Hbr. n-irayim „nostrils”, Syr. nāḥirā „nose” (Sem.: Leslau 1945, 236; 1969, 21; Rabin 1975, 88, #62). The correspondence of Eg. š vs. Sem. ḥ is, however, only admitted in the Rösslerian theory, not in the traditional system of the Egypto-Semitic comparison. C.T. Hodge (1961, 36), in turn, combined the Eg. noun with NOM.: Mocha šit-ó „nose”, although Eg. -r- = Mocha -t- has not been demonstrated. V. Orel and O. Stolbova (1992, 186) equated Eg. š.r.t with their CCh. *cīr- „nose”, where, however, the ultimate Chadic root contained an *-n- (hence -r- in CCh. via rhotacism).

⁸¹ A. Ember (ESS §4.f.11) figured a primary sense „chewer” on the one hand, but simultaneously (!), he affiliated it with Ar. labāḥa „vieillir, être très-âgé (se dit d’un homme)” [BK II 956] and even NAgaw forms like Qwara labak-ā, Bilin labak-ā „heart”, on the other hand. Naturally, all this cannot be valid at the same time. His idea on the relationship of Hbr. šēn and Ar. sinn- „tooth” vs. Ar. san-at- „year”, Hbr. √yšn and Ar. wasina (also wašina) „to sleep, be putrifying (of water)”, primarily „to become old, stale”, is however, noteworthy just like his argument that „the age of someone is determined by the teeth”. His apprentice, W.F. Albright added here Ar. laḥaba „stricken in years” (sic) recorded in fact as laḥiba „être très-maigre, amaigri de vieillesse” [BK II 971]. F. von Calice (GÄSW 116, #489) regarded Ember’s idea on the etymological „tooth” vs. „old” „unwahrscheinlich”, because, in his view, „die Begriffsverwandschaft von ‘Zahn’ und ‘Alter, aetas’ ist unbekannt”. He rightly pointed to that the Agaw words belong to Eg. jb „heart”. C.T. Hodge (1992, 202-206), in turn, assumed an unattested Eg. *j3bh akin to 3b.w „tusk, ivory”, *3b (attested 3b.t) „chisel”, and 3b „fingernail”, extended with a suffix -ḥ.

here too, even after deleting the phonologically evidently false ones,⁸² one is disturbed by the multitude of the diverse and quite attractive equipotential etymological proposals:

(1) A. Ember (1921, 177; 1926, 302, fn. 10; ESS §24.b.3), whose suggestion was quoted in GÄSW 169, #685 with doubt, identified it with Ar. *naḥaḍa* „to sharpen (a lance), loosen (flesh from bone)”, *naḥīd-* „sharp, pointed (spear-head)” [Ember] = *naḥaḍa* I „3. rendre mince et effilé (le fer d’une lance, etc.)”, *naḥīd-* „effilé, rendu mince, réduit dans sa largeur (fer d’une lance, etc.)”.⁸³

(2) I. Teitelbaum (quoted and approved by C.H. Gordon 1955, 294, #1206) associated it with Ug. *ngh N* „mit Hörnern stossen” [Aistleitner 1948, 211] = „to gore” [Gordon] = „aneinanderstossen” [WUS #1745], Hbr. *√ngh qal* „stossen (v. gehörnten Tieren)”, piel „stossen (m. d. Hörnern)” [GB 483],⁸⁴ which is possible as Eg. **√ndḥ* may indeed derive from AA **√ngh*.

(3) E. Edel (AÄG xxxix, lxiv, §256.A), followed by G. Fecht (1960, §374), J. Vergote (1973 Ib, 156), J. Osing (NBÄ 211), and W. Westendorf (KHW 137, fn. 8; LÄ VI 1319) saw in it an *n-Bildung* from Eg. *ḥd* „white”. Most of them also supposed a deverbal origin, namely from a lost Eg. **nḥd* verb *lae n-*, which was opposed by J. Osing (NBÄ 748-9, n. 908) arguing that there is no reason to assume **√nḥd*. Th Bardinet (1990, 43-44, 279), in turn, reconstructed **nj-ḥd.t* „la blanche” (sic, etymological rendering not given) supported by late puns.

(4) A.Ju. Militarev (MM 1983, 228-229) too surmised here an *n-* prefix formation comparing it with Sem. **hVt-* „arrow” [Mlt.], PCu. **HVč-* „острие” [Dlg. 1973, 303-4], and WCh. **h^waCV* „tooth” [Stl.].

(5) S. Cauville (1987, 183) equally applied a prefix *n-*, but she affiliated the word for „tooth” with Eg. *pḥd* „couper, séparer” derived by her (via an alleged *p-* prefix!) from Eg. *ḥd* (sic, in fact a verb IIIae inf.) „détruire”.

(6) V. Orel and O. Stolbova (HSED #1235) combined it with PRift **ḥunč-* „to chew” [Ehret 1980, 302] via metathesis and explained both from their AA **ḥanVč-*. This is the most tempting Afro-Asiatic etymology that has been so far offered.

(7) GT: or perhaps related to Sem. **nṣḥ* „to shine” [Leslau 1969, 60; KB 716] III NOM.: Kefoid (PGonga) **nečč-/neč-* „white” [GT]: Bworo *neč-a* (-ts’-), Beke *neč-o*, Anfillo *neč-o* (-ts’-), Boshia *neč-/nečč-o*, Kaffa *načč-o*, Mocha *nečč-o* (Crl. 1951, 478; Fleming 1987, 148, #5)? E. Cerulli (l.c.) supposed the Kaffa to have been the source of

⁸² L. Reinisch (1895, 180) and E. Zyhlarz (1932-33, 169; 1934, 59) equated Eg. *ndḥ.t* with Bed. *nad* „Zahn” [Rn.], which was apparently supported by F. von Calice (GÄSW 169, #685) and reaffirmed by M. Cohen (1947, 186, #449), although it is clearly wrong (because Bed. *d* has nothing to do with Eg. *ḍ*) as it has been pointed out already W. Vycichl (1960, 262). On the other hand, C.T. Hodge (1969, 108, #8) affiliated the Egyptian term with Sem.: Ar. *naṭaḥa* „to butt” (phonologically false, since Sem. **-t-* ≠ Eg. *-ḍ-*) and LECu.: Somali *ḍūḥ* „marrow” [Abr.] (semantically baseless). Later Hodge (1992, 205-6) derived Eg. *ndḥ.t* from Eg. *nd* „grind” with an affix *-ḥ*.

⁸³ Ch. Ehret (1995, 330, #644) extended this Arabo-Egyptian match to Ar. *√nḥt* „to shave, plane, scratch, saw off, carve wood or stone” III ECu. **ḥi/uh-* „to shape to a point” III WCh. **paw* „horn”, all these derived by him from his AA **ḥiḥ-* „to shape to a point”. Baseless.

⁸⁴ Strangely, A. Guillaume (1965 IV 16) equated Hbr. *√ngh* with Ar. *naṭaḥa* „to butt” (!), which is phonologically unacceptable.

Amh. *nāč* (henceforth, not root inherited from Semitic), whereas W. Leslau (l.c.), on the contrary, supposed in Kafa and other Kefoid reflexes too an Amharic borrowing.

(8) GT: since our term suspiciously has no cognates meaning „tooth” on Afro-Asiatic grounds, it is impossible not to take ESudanic **ṣig-t* „tooth” [Bnd. 2005, 31, #59] and thus also Nilo-Saharan **ṣḥ* „tooth” [Ehret 2001, 317, #267] into account as extra-Afro-Asiatic areal parallels with regard to their strikingly identical root vocalism. The Coptic data suggest an Eg. **ṣḥd.t* > **ṣḥd.t* (Edel, Vergote, Osing). I.e., we may project a pre-OEg. **ṣḥg-h.at* carrying the marker **-h-* of the nominal class of anatomical terms (Takács 1997). Actually, this scenario seems most convincing at the moment, i.e., we may have here a non-Afro-Asiatic word.

Eg. *ṣz* „Zahn” (MK-, Wb V 401, 1), fem. ***ṣz.t*** „Zahn” (XVIII., Wb V 409, 9-12): here we have a large scale of Afro-Asiatic nominal root varieties for „tooth” that are phonologically to be distinguished even if ultimately they may be perhaps interrelated (and are henceforth frequently compared in the literature including Eg. *ṣz*).⁸⁵

(1) AA **ṣks* [GT] > WBrb.: Zenaga *ūkš* ~ *ukši*, pl. *ūkš-ən* „dent (canine)” [Ncl. 1953, 96, 335] || Bed. *kōs* „Horn, Zahn” [Rn. 1895, 148] || SCu.: Qwadza *koʿos-iko* „molar tooth” [Ehret 1980, 264].

(2) AA **ṣks* [GT] > NBrb.: Shilh *a/u-ḥʷs* „tooth” [Bynon, l.c.], Sus *á-ḥʷs*, pl. *uḥs-ān* „dent” [Dst. 1938, 91] || SBrb.: Ahaggar *ta-mṣes-t*, pl. *ti-mṣās* „dent molaire” [Fcd. 1951-2, 1238] || HECu.: Gedeo *kekkešš-a* „molar (teeth)” [Hds. 1989, 100] || WCh.: Angas-Sura **haṣas* ~ **ha₃ṣa₃s* < orig. **hʷaṣas* (as in Goemaoid?) „tooth” [GT 2004, 152] = **agas* [Stl. 1977] = **haṣas* „tooth” [Dlg.] = **ṣas* [Stl. 1987] (Angas-Sura: Jng. 1965, 180; Hfm. 1975, 26, #246; Stl. 1972, 182; 1977, 152, #4; 1987, 226, #750).

(3) AA **ṣgs* [GT] > ECu. **gaws-* „molar, chin” [Sasse 1979, 45] = **gaws/š-* „tooth, a set of teeth” [Lmb.] || SCu.: Iraqw *gos-o* „incisor tooth” [Ehret 1980, 264] || NOm.: Kefoid (PGonga) **gaš(š)-* „tooth” [Blz. pace Flm. 1987, 153, §1] (Cu.-Om.: Rn. 1895, 148; Dlg. 1973, 70-71; Lmb. 1987, 533; Zbr. 1989, 583, #40).

As for the verbal background of these varieties, one of them really has it, cf. Sem. **ṣksus-* „masticare” [Frz. 1971, 631, #7.20] = **ṣkc* „жевать, грызть, крошить зубами” [Blv. 1993, 39, #121] > i.a. Akk. *kasāsu* ~ *kašāšu* „kauen, nagen”, *kasāsū* (pl.) „Zahnfleisch (?)”, kam/nzūzu „etwa: Zahnfleisch (?)” [AHW 453, 514] || Ar. **ṣkss* I „1. casser, broyer, piler avec force, en très-petits morceaux, 2. avoir les dents petites et courtes”, *kasas-* „petitesse des dents” [BK II 894] || SBrb.: Ahaggar *ə-kš* „to bite, eat” [Dlg.]⁸⁶ || HECu.: Sidamo *kis-* „mordere” [Crl. 1938 II 209].⁸⁷ In this context, with special

⁸⁵ Dolgopolskij 1964, 60 (sine Eg.); Bynon 1984, 271 (sine Eg.); Blažek 1989 MS Om., 29, #102 and 1994 MS Bed., 22 (sine Eg.); Orel Stolbova 1992, 171; HSED #1484.

⁸⁶ W. Vycichl (1989, 18, §6.b) reconstructed the underlying PBrb. root as **ṣwky* (so, without the sibilant element), which does not agree with the facts attested in the Berber daughter languages.

⁸⁷ A. Dolgopolsky (1983, 134, #7.8) affiliated the Ahaggar-Sidamo isogloss with Sem. **ṣnkt* „to bite”, which – provided its lae *n-* was indeed a root extension – might represent a further member of the above enumerated wide family of root varieties for „tooth”.

regard to Sem. * \sqrt{kss} , especially noteworthy is the OEg. hapax tss written with the same tusk determinative that is used also with Eg. $\text{j}\bar{\text{b}}\bar{\text{h}}$ and $\text{n}\bar{\text{h}}\bar{\text{d}}.\text{t}$ „tooth” (EG¹ 454, F18). This obscure and otherwise unknown verbal root only occurs in PT 118a „in Verbindung mit šnb.t ‘Brust’ von Personen” (Wb V 410, 10), which R.O. Faulkner ventured to render (as a pure „guess”) as „to tear (breast)” (AEPT 330).⁸⁸ It was G. Roquet (1984, 367) who has already surmised that PT tss – albeit under a quite different translation not really compatible with the tusk determinative⁸⁹ – is probably be related with Eg. $\text{t}\bar{\text{z}}.\text{t}$. All this might only be possible if Eg. $\text{t}\bar{\text{z}}.\text{t}$ from the New Kingdom does not reflect the historical writing of the word, which has unfortunately not yet been attested from the Old Kingdom. It is to be noted here that A.G. Belova (1989, 13), in turn, equated NK $\text{t}\bar{\text{z}}.\text{t}$ with a modern dialectal Ar. \sqrt{kzz} „сжимать, стискивать зубы, скрежетать зубами”. My suggestion for PT tss would be „to picken”, which – along with the tusk sign – would be well understandable from a hypothetic Eg. * tss „to bite” or the like.

„Tongue”

Eg. ns^{90} „Zunge” (OK, Wb II 8-17), act. * $\text{l}\bar{\text{i}}\text{s}$ (GT) → Cpt.: (OSB) $\lambda\alpha\epsilon$, (AFL) $\lambda\epsilon\epsilon$ „tongue” (KHW 80; CED 74; DELC 99) || Sem. * liš-ān- „lingua” [Frz. 1964 II, 270, #2.58] = * li/aš-ān- „tongue” [Djk.] = * liš(š)ān- [SED I 164, #181] || Brb. * $\sqrt{\text{ls}}$ „tongue” [Rsl.] = * $\text{a-lisi} \rightarrow \text{*e-lisi} \rightarrow \text{*i-lisi}$ [Vcl. 1972] = * a-lisiy [Vcl. 1990] = * i-ls , pl. * i-ls-awn [Durand 1993, 243; Lipiński] = * ?i-lis- [Dlg.] (Brb.: LR 2002, 329) || Ch. * $\sqrt{\text{ls}_3-}$ „tongue” [JS 1981, 272A and JI 1994 I 169] = * lisi [Vcl. 1972] = * lisy [Vcl. 1990] = * HV-IVs-Vm „(my) tongue” [Stl. 2005]: WCh. * ḥa-lisi-um [Stl. 1987, 237, #839] || CCh. * $\sqrt{\text{nš}}$, dissimilation from * $\text{l}\bar{\text{i}}\text{s}$ [Dlg.] || ECh. * l[i]s- [Dlg.] (Ch.: JI 1994 II, 328-329; Nwm. 1977, 33; Stl. 1977, 64; 2005, 78, #239), whence one has reconstructed AA * $\sqrt{\text{ls}}$ [Jušmanov 1937, 15-16] = * lis_2- [Dlg. 1990, 217-9] = * $\sqrt{\text{lsy}}$ [Vcl.] = * lis- [OS

⁸⁸ The context is: $\text{j}\bar{\text{h}}\bar{\text{c}}\bar{\text{j}}$ $\text{j}\bar{\text{h}}\bar{\text{nn}}.\text{w}$ wtz $\text{j}\bar{\text{b}}$ n tss.w šnb.t translated by R.O. Faulkner as „rejoice, o you who hoe (?)! Lift up the hearts of those who tore (?) the breast ...” (AEPT 37). As for why the tusk determinative was applied for a verb denoting an action of birds, he (AEPT 37, utt. 204, n. 2) speculated that the birds were tearing the breast „with their nails in grief (?)”. G. Roquet (1984, 368), in turn, regarded t(-)ss.w šnb.t as *participium conjunctum* characterizing a bird of prey (as bjk ʕ3-šnb.t „faucon au jabot considérable” does it in PT 1048c^P) arguing that „les deux syntagmes forment un composé déterminé par le signe du prédateur”. This line of thoughts resulted a rendering „qu’exalté soit le coeur des [rapaces] au jabot durci”, The text continues as ʕm-n=sn $\text{j}\bar{\text{r}}.\text{t}$ ḥr.w „parce qu’ils ont avalé l’Oeil d’Horus ...” and Roquet was thinking here of „la voracité des prédateurs entraînant la dilatatio croissante de leur gésier ou de leur jabot ..., qui devient alors de plus en plus ferme et dur du fait de la saturation”.

⁸⁹ He forced a derivation of the PT form (recognized by him as t(-)ss.w „participe passif masculin pluriel”) from his hypothetic Eg. tjs „1. rendre compact, consistent, coalescent, homogène, 2. (se) solidifier, (s’)affermir, (se) durcir, (s’)épaissir, prendre de la cohésion, former une masse uniforme”, hence specially „(en boulangerie) fra(i)ser une pâte”, which, however, has little in common with the tusk determinative in spite of Roquet’s ex cathedra statement that „le signe F18 ... semble retenu ici en fonction de symbole de ce qui est ‘dur, résistant’ ...”

⁹⁰ A. Roccati (1988, 118) attributes a value * nis (i.e., njs) to the tongue hieroglyph on the basis of the phonogrammatical *plene* writing njs in PT 383 with a complement - j - (cf. Wb II 324, 12) and also because of the application of the tongue sign in the writing of nj-sw „he belongs to” (Wb II 197, 4).

1990, 90, #48a; Mlt. 2005]. A widely know (almost) common Afro-Asiatic root with abundant literature.⁹¹ The question to be addressed here is whether the Egyptian term was of Semitic etymology. Convinced of that this was the case, W.A. Ward (1972, 20, §155-159) forced a far-fetched theory that „it seems better to assume that the final -n has dropped out in Egyptian and Berber rather than that it has been added in Semitic”. But it is quite obvious that the Semitic triliteral stem is due to an innovation, while the Berber and Chadic reflexes as well as Egyptian have retained the older biliteral root. There is a *communis opinio* on that the final Sem. *-ān- was not part of the original root.⁹² All this implies that Eg. *līs cannot be rendered as coming directly from Semitic.

Eg. sn.w „Zunge” (GR, Wb IV 155, 15) = „tongue” (PL 854): as – among others – P. Wilson (PL 854) concludes (quite naturally), it may well be the late metathesis of Eg. ns, but this supposition seems to be disproven by Eg. snk „Bez. für die Zunge (mit der die göttliche Kuh Hathor das Königskind leckt)” (XVIII., Wb IV 177, 1), which may be an extended form of a much earlier Eg. *sn „tongue”. Moreover, both Eg. sn and snk, as pointed out by V. Orel and O. Stolbova (HSED #2248), may be akin to SAgaw *caŋ- < **cank- (?) „tongue” [GT]⁹³ || WCh.: Nbauchi *s/šə/iŋk- „tongue” [Skn. 1977, 45] = *sinakA [Stl. 1987, 253] = *šin-(d/k)- [Skn. 1987, 81] > i.a. Diri šindū [IL] = šindū [Skn.] || CCh.: Hwona šene-wura „tongue” [Krf.] | Masa (Banana) sin-na „Zunge” [Lukas 1970, 33] = sin-da [Skn.] = sín-ná [Jng.]. N. Skinner (1987, 81) compared several of the above

⁹¹ For the AA comparison cf. Erman 1892, 113; Holma 1911, X; Ember 1911, 90; 1918, 31; 1930, #18.a.8; Meinhof 1912, 235; Albright 1918, 90; 1923, 67; Möller 1921, 195; 1924, 42; Farina 1924, 316; 1926, 17, 22; Calice 1928, 142, fn. 2; 1931, 34; Czermak 1931, 71; Vycichl 1933, 174; 1934, 72; 1958, 395; 1959, 38; 1972, 177; 1987, 112-113; 1989 passim; 1990, 56, 89; GÄSW 34, #61; Jušmanov 1937, 15-16; Vregote 1945, 136, #9.b.20; 1973 lb, 126, §79; Cohen 1947, #436; Ol’derogge 1952, 35; Lacau 1954, 98, fn. 1; 1954, 294-299; 1970, 19, §39; 1972, 304-5, §18-19 and 210, §29; AÄG 57, §130; Pilszczikowa 1958, 77; Leslau 1962, 67; Greenberg 1963, 63; D’jakonov 1965, 32, #47 and 40 (commented on by Müller 1968, 365); 1967, 187; 1970, 457, fn. 14; 1974, 742; Mukrovsky 1966, 17, #44; 1987, 388; Gouffé 1971-2, 105, #1; 1974, 362; Porhomovskij 1972, 65, #39.3; Fleming 1974, 90; Gazov-Ginzberg 1974, 26; Bender 1975, 192, #87.1; IS 1976, #273; Hodge 1976, 12, #41; 1981, 376; 1981, 410; Conti 1978, 12, fn. 2; Rössler 1979, 22; Jungraithmayr 1982, 8; 1987, 26; 1994, 230; Rabin 1982, 28, #27; Bynon 1984, 270, #30; Faber 1984, 202, #12; DELC 99; Dombrowski 1987, 113-114, §ii; Skinner 1987, 79-83; 1992, 355; Dolgopolsky 1990, 213, 217; 1994, 268-270, #2; 1999, 54-55, #181; Sasse 1991, 271, #1.3; HSED #1666; Ehret 1995, 406, #827; Lipiński 1997, 235, §30.11; SED I 165; Vernus 2000, 176 and fn. 51-53 with lit.; Militarev 2005, 104.

⁹² N.V. Jušmanov (1998, 177): class marker -n of body parts. A.M. Gazov-Ginzberg (1974, 26): „уменьшительный элемент” *-n-. A. Faber (1984, 202, #12): nominalizing *-ān suffix. So also P. Lacau (1972, 308, §25). A. Dolgopolsky (l.c.): *-ān- nominal derivational suffix. A. Zaborski (1991, 1677): suffix -n. E. Lipiński (1997, 235, §30.11): „determinant -n in body parts’ names”. L. Kogan (SED l.c.): suffixed *-ān. The latter author was pondering that „the double -ss- in Arm. and Eth. would have pointed to a deverbal formation of the verb *līšš ‘to lick’, if it were not for the Afrasian nominal reconstruction and the fact that the verb in question is attested only in Arb. lss ‘lécher, manger’ [BK 2 989]”, i.e., Sem. *līš-ān- is naturally ultimately (in the Afro-Asiatic proto-language) related to (the corresponding parental PAA verbal root of) Ar. √lss, but cannot have been directly derived thereof.

⁹³ Attested in Awngi caŋ [Ehret 1987, #449], Awiya-Kwakora caŋ „tongue” [Flm. 1969, 26, #34], Awiya-Dangela cangi „tongue” [Flm.], Kunfāl šāŋ „tongue” [Birru-Adal 1971, 102, #87]. Note that usually Agaw *ŋ derives from PCu. *m, but sometimes from *nK too.

listed words also with WCh.: Nbauchi forms with *-l- || CCh.: PMasa *šin/l-(d)- [Skn.] > i.a. Zime-Dari šilli [Str.], Zime-Batna sîlé [Jng.] = sîlî [Scn.] || ECh. *√sln [Skn.]: Kera kə-səl „Zunge”, ku-sul-dù „seine Zunge” [Ebert 1976 II 70] | Sokoro sólañd- [Nct.] = selindu [AF] = sélèp [Saxon] (Ch.: JI 1994 II 328-9). These parallels with *-l- may, nevertheless, represent a distinct Afro-Asiatic root, being eventually related with Bed. sil „Speichel, Geifer” [Rn. 1895, 198] || CCh.: Buduma čílúlū „Speichel” [Nachtigal] = čilúlú [Cyffer, JI 1994 II 279]. It may also well be that AA *√sl „tongue, saliva” [GT] is ultimately nothing else but merely the old (Proto-Afro-Asiatic) metathesis of AA *√ls as suggested by a number of Chadicists on the level of Chadic.⁹⁴

Eg. nt „Zunge” (PT, Spiegel 1971, 442, fn. 20; ÄWb I 1602a) = „tongue” (AEPT 180):⁹⁵ here too, no Semitic cognates are attested. On the African side of the family, regular correspondences are known from LECu.: Arbore -læke (?) „tongue” [Bender 1971, 251, #87]⁹⁶ || WCh. *√lk „Zunge” [JS 1981, 27A₂]:⁹⁷ Dera yílák „tongue”, cf. yílèk „saliva” [JI 1994 I 169] = yilik [Skinner 1987, 82] | Sbauchi *√lk „tongue” [GT].⁹⁸ Whether CCh.: Lamang nəhek „tongue” [Meek] | (?) PMandara *√rh [r < *n] „tongue” [GT]⁹⁹ (Ch. data: JI 1994 II 328-9) are directly related¹⁰⁰ or derive rather from a special Central

⁹⁴ Namely C. Ebert (1978, 50); C. Gouffé (1971-2, 105, §1); H. Jungraithmayr and K. Shimizu (1981, 272A); H. Jungraithmayr and D. Ibrizimow (1994 I 169).

⁹⁵ Attested (pace Spiegel l.c.) in nt-bs „Flammenzunge” (PT 396c) and supposedly also in the divine name hr.w-hr-nt=f (PT 1088b-c, Wb II 357, 9). Reluctant to accept it as a distinct lexeme on its own, K. Sethe (ÜKAPT VI 145) tried to render it as a „Nebenform zu” (!) Eg. ns „Zunge” (phonologically impossible) or nt „die Fesselnde”. L.H. Lesko (1972, 110, 111, n. j) rendered nt in CT VII 422b-c too as „tongue” referring to PT 1088c, which was objected by R.O. Faulkner (AECT III 158, spell 1101, n. 5) as no tongue determinative is used in the CT exx.: „my impression is that 422b-c is quite corrupt”. R. van der Molen (DCT 256) too saw in these CT instances just a variety of ntnt „secretion, saliva”. Similarly, D. Meeks (2005, 248, #669a) viewed that the writing in CT VII 422b and 435c „déterminé par la bouche qui crache suggère plutôt ‘sécrétion, cracher’. La référence à PT 396c est sans doute à comprendre nt=s comme dans CT VI 270e”. Also B. Backes (2005, 395, 456) gives for CT VII (Zweigegebuch) nt „Gewölle (?)”, das Ausgespuckte”.

⁹⁶ Misquoted as Tsamay laeke by N. Skinner (1987, 81).

⁹⁷ H. Jungraithmayr and D. Ibrizimow (1994 I 169), in turn, suppose that the West Chadic root (referred to by them as ly-g forms) stems from Benue-Congo *-lake (De Wolff), which is hardly probable in the light of the Afro-Asiatic cognates.

⁹⁸ Cf. Geji leka, Zul and Booluu (Migang) ləka, Zaranda ləgà, Zeem ləgə, Tule, Chaari, and Dokshi lyaaga (Sbauchi: Smz. 1978, 32, #50).

⁹⁹ Attested in Glavda árəḥa [Rapp] = éreḥa [Büchner], Guduf árəḥà [IL] = árḥè [Wolff 1971, 70, #20], Gava rəḥe [Büchner], Yaghwatadaxa rəḥə [Wolff], Dghwede (Truade) réḥè [Frick 1976 MS, 1, #9] = rəḥè [Frick in JI] = árḥà [IL] = rəḥə [Büchner], Gvoko éreḥe [Büchner], Ngwshe rúḥi [IL] = éreḥa [Büchner], Bokwa árəḥe [Büchner] (Mandara: Büchner 1964, 43-44). Searching for possible cognates of this CCh. root, C. Gouffé (1971-2, 106, #3) suggested either Ch. *√ns „tongue” or „rather” Sem. *√lḳḳ, *√lḳh, *√lhš „to lick” and even Brb. (sic) əlləy „to lick” and LECu.: Oromo lagā „language”. Naturally, all these forms may not be interrelated but preserve diverse AA roots.

¹⁰⁰ As O. Stolbova (2005, 59-60, #152) insisted. In order to derive both the West (with *-l-) and the Central Chadic (*n- and C₂ < *-l-/*-k-?) forms, she created an artificial PCh. *n-IV[h]-k- „tongue”. By the way, Stolbova’s derivation of ECh.: Toram liho „tongue” [Alio] from the same root is a rude error as this is merely a reflex of Ch. *lis- with a regular shift of *-s- > -h-.

Chadic root variety $\sqrt{\text{nk}}$ „tongue” [GT]. It cannot be decided which variety the Eg. word is directly cognate with. L. Reinisch (1884, 386; 1887, 257) and H.G. Mukarovsky (1987, 28 and 266) combined the Chadic root with Sem.: Ar. laqlaq- „langue” [BK II 1016]¹⁰¹ || NAgaw *lanq- „tongue” [Apl. 1991, 20] || LECu.: Oromo lag-á „Zunge” [Rn.]¹⁰² (which seems to be isolated in ECu.).¹⁰³

„Lung”

Eg. zm3 „Lunge” (PT-, Wb III 445-446)¹⁰⁴ was correctly equated by C.T. Hodge (1990, 646, §15.B) with Sem. $\sqrt{\text{zmr}}$ „to blow, make music” [Hodge],¹⁰⁵ among whose reflexes especially noteworthy are Ar. zamara „jouer de l’instrument à vent appelé zammār-at-, remplir une outre, crier etc.”, zammār-at- „espèce de flûte composée de deux tuyaux, sorte de collier en bois” [BK I 1010] = zamara „souffler dans un roseau, jouer de la flûte”, zammār-at- „espèce de flûte” [DRS] = „to pipe, play upon a reed, blow in a mizmār- (a musical reed or pipe, now called flute)” [Lane 1250] = zamara „embouche (cor, trompette), chanter, gronder, remplir une outre” [Dozy I 602] (Sem.: DRS 751).¹⁰⁶ In addition, Hispanian Ar. zummāra „gosier, panse des ruminants” as well as zamara „remplir une outre” [DRS] represent one step even further than „flute”¹⁰⁷ does on the way towards how the sense „lung” developed in Egyptian.

¹⁰¹ Ch. Ehret (1989, 180-1, #50) reconstructed Ar. biconsonantal $\sqrt{\text{q-}}$ “to lap” on the basis of $\sqrt{\text{lqq}}$ “to lick, lap” $\sqrt{\text{lqq}}$ “to move the jaws tremulously and put out the tongue (snake), smack with the tongue” etc.

¹⁰² Oromo g can only derive from ECu. *g, but not from *k or *ḳ (Sasse 1979, 55). This is why it cannot be directly identified with WCh. $\sqrt{\text{lk}}$ „tongue”.

¹⁰³ Note that SCu.: Dahalo lúga „language” [Eld. 1973 MS, 3, #138; EEN 1989, 43] is a borrowed from Swahili.

¹⁰⁴ Its old equation (proposed in Holma 1919, 43 and GÄSW 191, #778) with Sem.: Akk. (jB) šammāḫu „Dickdarm” [AHW 1156] (misquoted in these works as šamāḫḫu „Magen”) and Geez sāmāḥ ~ sāmāḥ „spleen” [Lsl.] is certainly excluded. F. von Calice (GÄSW l.c.) is right that „*man könnte Erweichung v. zm3 < *sm3 annehmen, doch bliebe der Wandel des ḫ → 3 auffällig*”. Moreover, Akk./Sem. š- is simply ≠ Eg. z- (only Akk./Sem. s- vs. Eg. z- is attested). The Akk. word is in the AHW l.c. treated as a Sumerian loan (^{uz}šā-maḫ, lit. „big entrail”), while the Geez one has been affiliated by L. Reinisch (1887, 308) rather with Agaw: Bilin zanqi ~ sanqi „liver”, although recently L. Kogan (SED I 217-8, #247) sides with the cognacy of the Akk.-Eth. parallel acknowledging that, „*in any case, the coincidence of apparently independent Sem. ... and Sum. terms is fascinating*”. P. Lacau (1970, 94-95, §246), in turn, explained Eg. zm3 internally from the homoradical verb zm3 „to unite” as „le poumon est le type bien net de l’organe composé de deux parties identiques, les deux poumons”. Alternatively, he was pondering „*si le nom de l’organe vient du verbe dénominatif: ‘lier comme sont liés les deux poumons’. Presque tous les organes du corps ont engendré des verbes dénominatifs.*”

¹⁰⁵ The Semitic root has been usually combined rather with Eg. zb3 “Flöte blasen” (OK-, Wb III 433), see Ember 1913, 111, #9; GÄSW 1936, #291; Vergote 1945, 129; Vycichl 1958, 371; DRS 572.

¹⁰⁶ Ar. zamr- quoted by F. von Calice (GÄSW l.c.) and W. Vycichl (l.c.) with the sense „Flöte” has been in fact attested as „chalumeau, flageolet, hautbois, trompette” [Dozy I 602]. In other lexicons of Classical Arabic it occurs solely as „chant” [BK I].

¹⁰⁷ SCu. *zumar- [GT]: Ma’a izumarī „flute” [Ehret 1980, 201, #6] may be either a borrowing from Arabic or a cognate ultimately deriving from AA $\sqrt{\text{zmr}}$ „to blow (a flute)” [GT]. By the way, Ch. Ehret (l.c.) identified the Ma’a word with ERift: Qwadza cemaliko (ts-) „straw” to reconstruct a common SCu. *cōmārī „straw”,

Eg. wf3 „Lunge” (BD, Wb I 306, 3): following Belova's Law (cf. EDE I 394-400), we may safely presume Eg. wf3 to have originated in AA *ful-, i.e. w- was part of the original biconsonantal root reflecting the ultimate AA root vowel *-u-,¹⁰⁸ which is now corroborated by cognates like WCh.: Angas-Sura *folok ~ *felek → *fəlok (or perhaps *f^w-?)¹⁰⁹ „lung” [GT 2004, 109]¹¹⁰ | Bokkos fəlök „Lunge” [Jng. 1970, 141] || CCh.: Bachama fəfuləwey „lungs” [Krf.]. The underlying AA *ful-/ *f^wal- „lung” [GT],¹¹¹ which finds an areal parallel in PWNigritic *p^hul-, *p^hulp^hul- „lungs” [Smz. 1981, 16, #70], may eventually have been derived from AA *√f^wl „to blow” [GT].¹¹²

but this is both semantically („straw” ≠ „flute”) and phonologically (Ma'a z- = Qwadza z-, Takács 2011, 121) problematic.

¹⁰⁸ P. Lacau (1970, 95, #248), however, supposed in it a w- prefix (Lacau: „*suffixe formant les instrumentaux*”) derivation from an unattested *f3, whose „nifal” stem he figured in Eg. nf3 [reg. < *nfr] „ausniesen, (aus)schnauben” (CT, Wb II 252, 3; Osing 1986, 209, n. a) = „respirer, souffler” (Lacau 1972, 36, §43, #5) = „expirer, expulser (du nez)” (Cannuyer 1983, 26) = „to blow, exhale” (DCT 222). But, unfortunately, Lacau ignored the external evidence, cf. Sem.: JNAram. npr „to blow the nose” [Sabar 2002, 234] || NBBr. *√nfr „to exhale” [GT]: Nefusa e-nfer „se moucher” [Mtl. 1904, 138] | Tamazight (Zemmur) nfer „se moucher”, a-nfur, pl. a-nfur-n „1. (gros) nez, 2. narine” [Taifi 1991, 473] | Qabyle neffer „1. exhaler, expirer, souffler (l'air, fumée, vapeur), 2. fumer” [Dlt. 1982, 551] || SBrb.: Ahaggar e-nfer [Fcd. 1951-2, 1319-21], ETawillemmet & Ayr ə-nfər „renâcler (cheval, âne, chèvre, personne)”, nəfərənəfər „1. ronfler longuement par le nez (personne, animal), renâcler, s'ébrouer, frémir, expulser l'air avec bruit, 2. inspirer l'air avec bruit par le nez” [PAM 2003, 595-6], which suggest an AA *√nfr „to blow the nose” [GT], a fully distinct origin with initial *-n- as part of the ultimate triconsonantal root. V. Orel (1995, 103, #43), in turn, explained Eg. wf3 from his AA *fi/uʔ- (sic, with *-ʔ-) „lungs, stomach”, a product of pure fancy, based on a phonologically unacceptable comparison with Bed. fiʔ and LECu. *fiʕ-, which is certainly false as Eg. -3 has nothing on common with LECu. *ʕ-.

¹⁰⁹ Since the only evidence for *f^w- is one single Angas record [Flk.] (which can be secondary labialization as well), the reflexes could be alternatively explained from AS *folok ~ *felek.

¹¹⁰ Attested in Angas (hill) fwölök (so, fw-!) „the lungs” [Flk. 1915, 182], Sura fəlök „Lungen” [Jng. 1963, 65] = fəlök [fəlök < *fəlok] „lungs” [Krf.], Mupun flök ~ fūlfūk „lung” [Frj. 1991, 18], Mushere folok „lungs” [Dkl. 1997 MS], Goemay felek „the lungs” [Srl. 1937, 48] = filil (so! error for *filik?) „lungs” [Krf.] = fəlek [-ə- < -e-] „lungs” [Hlw. 2000 MS, 9].

¹¹¹ The Chadic words for “lung” were erroneously affiliated in HSED #775 with HECu. *afale “liver” [Hds. 1989, 404] and NOm.: Kefoid (PGonga) *afar-o “liver” [Bnd. 2003, 168, #81] = *afār- [GT]. But as H.G. Mukarovsky (1987, 103; 1989 MS, 5) rightly pointed out, this HECu.-Kefoid parallel represents a distinct AA root with different Chadic cognates such as WCh.: Angas-Sura *falak ~ *folok „liver” [GT 2004, 104]: Chip fəlök [fəlök < *fəlok?] „liver” [Krf.], Tal fəlök [Krf.], Montol fəlök [Krf.], Goemay falak „the liver” [Srl. 1937, 47] = fələ (so, no 3rd consonant) „liver” [Krf.] = falak „liver” [Hlw. 2000 MS, 9] || CCh.: Fali-Bwagira farən „liver” [Krf.] | Gisiga me-vel (prefix me-) „Leber” [Lukas 1970, 129]. The final *-k in Angas-Sura might be the suffix *-k of body parts.

¹¹² Cf. LECu.: Afar fult-o „blowing, puffing” [PH 1985, 105] | Oromo fəl-ä „odore” [Crl. 1938 II 200] = fəl-ī „odor”, fəll-a-wa „to have odor, give scent” [Gragg 1982, 148] | HECu. *fəl- „to breathe”, *fəl-e „breath, odor, smell” [Hds. 1989, 106-7, 409] || NOm.: Gimirra-Beneshe pel „to blow (e.g., on fire)” [Wdk. 1990, 109] || WCh.: Daffo-Butura fəl „Pfeife” [Jng. 1970, 214] | Burma fwale „to blow” [Krf.], Kir fwale „to blow (mouth)” [Csp. 1994, 42], Guruntum fali „to blow” [Jaggar 1989, 183] || CCh.: Musgu-Puss fili „vanner au vent” [Trn. 1991, 88] | Zime fəl „to blow” [Krf.] || ECh.: Kera fuulí „blasen, wehen” [Ebert 1976, 46]. The ECU. word was borrowed into Gurage: Mäsqān, Wolane fol, Selti fəl „breat, *odor that comes from the mouth” (Leslau 1979 III 231).

„Heart”

Eg. j̥b [$< *l̥b$]¹¹³ „heart” (OK, Wb I 59-60) || Sem. *libb- „heart” [Fronzaroli 1964, 272, #2.73; Leslau 1945, 235; SED I 157-8, #174] = *libw- [Vycichl] = *l̥bab- [Dlg.] → *lubb- influenced by *-bb- [GT] || Brb. *ulh $< **ul̥b$ „heart” [GT] = *ulh $< **luh$ $< **luv$ $< **lub$ [Rössler] = $*\sqrt{h_1lh_3}/*\sqrt{wlh_3}$ (?) [Prasse] = *luhi $< *lubi$ [Blz.] || Bed. lēb „Bauch, Magen, Herz” [Rn. 1895, 155] || NAgaw *IV[bb]Vk- „heart” [Dlg.] = *l̥bək-/*l̥bāk- (suffix *k) [Apl.] | SAgaw: Awngi yelib „woman’s breast” [Flm.] || ECu. *lubb- „heart, soul” [Sasse 1982, 135-136], cf. also LECu. *labʔ-/*laʔb- „breastbone” [Sasse 1979, 52; 1982, 133] || SCu.: Asa liba „breast, chest” [Flm.] (Cu.: Ehret 1987, #114) || NOm.: Kefoid (PGonga) *libb-V „heart” [Fleming 1987, 149, #2] (NOm.: Cerulli 1938 III 81; Bender-Fleming 1976, 52; Lamberti 1993, 370) || SOm.: Ari (Ubamer) l̥pa, l̥ba „heart” [Fleming], Galila l̥ba „belly” [Fleming] || PCh. *I(V)bV „внутренности” [IS] = $*\sqrt{lb}$ „belly” [Hodge]: CCh.: Dghwede (Zeghwana) ruvè vs. arvè „heart” [Kraft], Mandara órvúúḍè „Herz” [Lukas] | Musgoy lib „Leib” [Strümpell 1910, 453], Daba libi „ventre” [Mouchet 1966, 132] = l̥bī „belly” [Lienhard], Kola ž̥bí „belly” [Schubert] | PKotoko *(V)n̥₂(V)b(/pʰ)V „hear, soul” [Prh.] || ECh.: Mokilko ʔulbé „heart” [Jng. 1990, 189] = ʔulbò „my heart” [Lukas 1977, 221]. This is a widely known common Afro-Asiatic word with abundant literature.¹¹⁴ Whether Eg. j̥b is a „Semitic” word is hard to answer. In any case, the palatalization of the Anlaut *l- $>$ j- speaks for a subsequent *-i-. It is also to be researched, to what extent the Cushito-Omotc reflexes represent sg. inherited directly from Proto-Afro-Asiatic or old loans from Ethio-Semitic as it is the case with Kefoid in the opinion of H.C. Fleming (l.c. supra). Not being aware of the extra-Semitic parallels, H. Grapow (1954, 63-64) was convinced of a special Semitic cognacy of Eg. j̥b: „Das Wort j̥b ist urverwandt mit dem Semitischen, ist im Koptischen nicht mehr vorhanden, in welchem es, und dieser Vorgang hat im Spätägyptischen begonnen, durch das Wort ḥ3.tj verdrängt und ersetzt ist”.

Eg. ḥ3.tj „Herz” (PT, Wb III 26-27): all attempts at an external etymology¹¹⁵ have proven vain for phonological reasons. Quite naturally, since this term, as formulated

¹¹³ With regard to Eg. mjnb “ax” written sometimes with a heart hieroglyph carrying apparently the consonantal value jnb, C.T. Hodge (1976, 20-21, n. 56) concluded to that the word for “heart” is in fact jnb with a probable dialect var. j̥b.

¹¹⁴ See Erman 1892, 107; Holma 1911, X; Ember 1918, 31; Vycichl 1934, 42; 1938, 131-132; 1955, 320; 1958, 372, 390; 1972, 175-176; Calice 1936, #6; Vergote 1945, 132, #2.e.3; Cohen 1947, 184, #443; Rössler 1952, 134; 1964, 213; Greenberg 1963, 58; Dolgopolskij 1964, 60; 1973, 229; 1983, 125; 1987, 195, #1; 1994 MS, 14, #19; D’jakonov 1965, 41; 1970, 457, fn. 14; IS 1966, 20; Mukarovskij 1966, 18, #53; 1989 MS, 1, #3; Fleming 1969, 8; 1974, 89; 1976, 318; Prasse 1969, 27; Ward 1972, 22, ##238-240; Prh. 1972, 40, #21.2; Bender 1975, 169; Hodge 1976, 12, #56; 1981, 410; 1990, 646, #9B; Blažek 1989 MS, 7, #11; 1992, 136-137; Zaborski 1989, 583, #39; OS 1992, 186; 1992, 170; HSED #1668.

¹¹⁵ H. Holma (1919, 40, n. 1) combined it, e.g., with Akk. irtu “Lunge”, whence he erroneously reconstructed a nowhere attested Sem. *hirtu „Brust” (sic), although the Common Semitic term for „lung” has never had *ḥ-, cf. *riʔ-at-/*ir-at- (SED I s.v.). M. Cohen (1947, #134), in turn, compared – with some doubts – Brb. (sic, language

by several specialists of Egyptian philology, is nothing else but a nisbe of Eg. 3.t „front part” and so – as H. Grapow (1954, 64) writes – it „bezeichnet das Organ augenscheinlich als das ‘vorn’ im Körper befindliche”. Discussing this nisbe rendered as „celui du devant”, P. Lacau (1970, 93-94) was correctly concluding that „ce nom du cœur est une dérivation égyptienne; le mot n’a pas de correspondant en sémitique, il est relativement récent”.

Eg. jdr „Herz” (LP, Wb I 155, 1) was affiliated by V. Orel and O. Stolbova (1992, 186; HSED #127) with a number of attractive parallels, which, however, represent two distinct AA roots:

(1) PAngas *dūr (from *duyur?) „heart” [GT 2004, 97],¹¹⁶ which stands apparently isolated even within Angas-Sura.¹¹⁷ If there is a West Chadic cognate, it is perhaps Angas-Sura *duyur „kidney” [GT 2004, 96],¹¹⁸ which – strangely – has no reflex in Angas with the sense „kidney”, where *dūr is regularly derivable from **duyur.

(2) SCu. *dūr- „intestines” [Ehret 1980, 167]¹¹⁹ ||| ECh.: Lele dūrè ~ dūrò „1. centre, milieu, 2. quartier (village)” [WP 1982, 18].¹²⁰

„Hand”

Eg. *d (Osing: *jād) „die Hand, als Hieroglyphe für d, nur im Schriftzeichen belegt” (Wb V 414, 3), hence dj.w (m), dj.t (f) „5” (OK-, Wb V 420, 9-12),¹²¹ reflected in Coptic as *dô(j.ă)w (m) → (S) ⲧⲟϣ, *dôj.ăt (f) → (S) ⲧⲉ,¹²² which is usually regared to have

not specified) a-gad „intérieur de la poitrine”. W. Leslau (1949, 314) assumed it to be better to be connected with Eth. ʔəngədʔa or ʔəngədʔa „breast”. V. Orel and O. Stolbova (1992, 186) CCh. *ḥay- „heart”.

¹¹⁶ Attested only in Angas duur „heart” [Ormsby 1914, 209] = duur „heart, breast” [Flk. 1915, 174] = dúúr „Herz” [Jng. 1962 MS] = dūr „heart” [ALC 1978, 14] = dur [-ř] „heart” [Kraft] = dūr „heart” [Gochal 1994, app.].

¹¹⁷ A.B. Dolgopolsky (1982, 33) mistakenly identified the Angas word for “heart” (misleadingly rendered by him also as “chest”) with Sura túgúr “chest”, which is, however, to be derived from Common Angas-Sura *tuyur ~ *toyor „1. side/trunk of body, 2. chest, breast” [GT 2004, 386], which was followed by V. Orel and O. Stolbova (l.c.), who forged a false WCh. *ʔV-dur- „heart” with an unattested *d and a short *-u-. Dolgopolsky’s external comparison with Ar. zawr- „upper part of the breast” is equally unacceptable for phonological reasons (Angas d- ≠ Sem. z-).

¹¹⁸ Attested in Sura dúgúr „Niere” [Jng. 1963, 65] = dugur „kidney” [Krf.], Mupun dúur „kidney” [Frj. 1991, 17], Chip dūgur (so, plain d-! error) „kidney” [Krf.], perhaps Goemay dââr [ḏɔɔr, *ḏāɔr < *dʷaɣar or *ḏoyor?] „the perineum” [Srl. 1937, 23].

¹¹⁹ Based by Ch. Ehret (l.c.) on the comparison of Iraqw durumi „first stomach”, Burunge durumiya „large intestines”, and Dahalo dūra „intestines”, which he later (Ehret 1987, 55, #203) affiliated with Agaw *zír- „intestines”. This latter etymology is, nevertheless, incorrect as the first radicals do not correspond.

¹²⁰ This isolated form is, naturally, insufficient for assuming an ECh. *dur- “middle” as Orel and Stolbova (l.c.) suggested.

¹²¹ See Müller 1909, 191, fn. 2; Sethe 1916, 22, §5; 1927, 60-61; Ember 1917, 88, fn. 1; Albright 1918, 91; Homburger 1928, 336-337; Zyhlarz 1931, 136-137, #5; Brunner-Traut, LÄ II 582; Loprieno, LÄ VI 1308. Note that F. Lexa (1922, 176) erroneously explained the Eg. numeral from another word for “hand” (ḏr.t ~ ḏ3.t).

¹²² NBÄ 313, 392-3, 436, n. 100, 860, n. 1335.

originated in a nisbe ***jād.īy** (Osing, Loprieno) rendered as **“belonging to hand”** (GT) = „die zu einer Hand Gehörigen” (Osing) or „hand, pentad (of fingers)” (Albright pace Sethe). This derivation, paralleled by a number of analogical instances,¹²³ is actually based on the commonly accepted¹²⁴ comparison of Eg. ***d** with Common Sem. ***yad-** „hand”,¹²⁵ which was denied by Rösslerian E.A. Knauf (1982, 31, 34) unconvincingly combining the Eg. word with Akk. **ūtu** „Spanne”.

Eg. *ḏr.t* ~ *ḏ3.t*¹²⁶ „Hand” (PT-, Wb V 580-9 vs. 516, 5-8) = „palm of the hand” (Müller 1909, 191) has no Semitic background. On the contrary, some researchers (e.g., Kaplony in KBIÄF 160, n. 208, presented by A. Loprieno in LÄ V 1212 as the „*communis opinio*”) suppose here an Egyptian innovation literally signifying **“Greiferin”** derived from a hypothetic Eg. ***√ḏr**, whose root variety with an extension **n-** is attested as **nḏrj** „fassen, packen” (OK, Wb V 382-3). Not necessarily contradicting this theory, I have elsewhere (EDE I) suggested a cognacy with CCh. ***√ngr** [GT]: Daba ngra „Arm” [Str. 1910, 453] = ngər ~ ngra „bras, main, doigt” [Mch. 1966, 143], Musgoy wúri ḡgra „hand” [Mch.], Kola ḡgrá „hand” [Schubert] | Musgum ḡgrange „arm” [Roeder] | Buduma ngəru „shoulder” [Grb.] (CCh.: JI 1994 II 179) || ECh. ***√grN** „hand, wing, shoulder” [Skn. 1992, 346]: Karbo goreny „shoulder” [Grb. 1963, 62]. In A. Loprieno’s (LÄ V 1214, n. 31) opinion, however, „*besser wäre m.E. in einer Sprachtabu-Perspektive die Interpretation ‘die Fernhaltende’ bzw. ‘Fernzuhaltende’*”, i.e., a derivation from Eg. **ḏr** „fernhalten von jem., (einen Zustand) beseitigen, (Fuss, Schreiten) aufhalten” (PT-, Wb V 595, 5-7). It is a pity that he was unable to establish this semantical development in the light of convincing parallels. All other proposals for the etymology of Eg. **ḏr/3.t** are out of the question. The very old comparison with Hebrew **zeret** and Aram. **zartā** „span”¹²⁷ fails because Eg. **ḏ** = Sem. ***z** can only occur in loans, but not genetic cognates. The same pertains to the frequent equation of Eg. **ḏr.t** with Sem. ***ḏirāʿ-** „shoulder” [Frz.

¹²³Cf., e.g., Brb. a-fus “hand” vs. “5” [Zhl.], Bed. ey ~ ay “5” [Almkvist] = ay ~ ay „5” < „Hand” [Rn. 1894, 10] = äy ~ ey „5” vs. eyi „hand, forearm” [Roper] = áy ~ ayī „5” [Hudson] (Bed.: Zaborski 1987, 328).

¹²⁴Hommel 1883, 440, n. 30; Ember 1913, 115, #50; 1918, 30; Sethe 1916, 22-23; ESS §26.a.17; GÄSW 25, #11; Vergote 1945, 131, #2.a.3; Cohen 1947, #493; Gordon 1957, 273; Vycichl 1958, 373; 1959, 39, 1985, 174-5, §4; Faulkner 1959, 102-3; Hodge 1976, 12, #47; DELC 223; MM 1983, 219; Loprieno in LÄ V 1212, 1213, n. 26, VI 1308; Hodge 1990, 647, #23.A.

¹²⁵Sem. data: Rabin 1975, 88, #37; Leslau 1945, 233.

¹²⁶Their variation (noted already by Erman 1892, 126, fn. 2; Müller 1909, 191; Möller 1921, 196; Lexa 1922, 176 without explanation) may be due – as W. Vycichl (1990, 40, 196) rightly pointed out – to that of the *status absolutus* ***ḏār.t** > Cpt. (S) **ⲧⲱⲣⲉ** vs. *status pronominalis* ***ḏār.t** = > ***ḏā3.t** = > Cpt. (S) **ⲧⲱⲟⲧ** =. G. Farina (1926, 17) noted also a pl. **ḏ3.wt**.

¹²⁷Sethe 1912, 94; Albright 1918, 90; Farina 1924, 324; 1926, 16; ESS §24.c.1; Yeivin 1932, 73, fn. 6; GÄSW 227, #946; Brunner 1969, 88, #483; Ward 1972, 22, #293, Conti 1976, 267, fn. 18. A cognacy was correctly rejected already by W. M. Müller (1909, 191) due semantical considerations. Following Bondi (1894, 132 and fn. 1), who established Hbr. **mēzāh** as a loan from Eg. **mdh**, Th. Lambdin (1953, 149-150) did not rule out a borrowing into Semitic in the MK or even before „when a **gart-* was current” in Egyptian. This hypothesis is in full accordance with the rules of Canaanite *nomina segolata* (Dolgopolsky 1986).

1964, 259],¹²⁸ where the Sem. C₃ would not even be reflected in Egyptian.¹²⁹ Also C.T. Hodge's (1979, 497) comparanda displaying an initial *t-¹³⁰ are evidently out of question as Eg. ḏ ≠ Sem. *t-. In the opinion of E.A. Knauf (1982, 37, n. 19), „*zweifelloso gehört äg. /ḏrt/ mit akk. qātu zusammen*“, whose „*mittlere Liquide wurde im Akkadischen an den Vokal assimiliert*“ (!). One cannot be surprised enough at this astonishing suggestion contradicting the elementary rules of the Akkadian historical phonology.¹³¹ Th. Schneider (1997, 208, #116), in turn, projected a nowhere attested pre-Eg. *qaltu (sic) wishing to equate it with NBrb.: Tamazight i-yil „Arm, Vorderarm, Elle“ | Qabyle i-yil „Arm, Elle“ || Tuareg a-yil „(ganzer) Arm“, which *lautgeschichtlich* represents another mistake.¹³²

Eg. ḡḏ (NK)¹³³ ~ **ḡḏ.t** (XXII.)¹³⁴ ~ **ḡḏ** (4th cent. BC)¹³⁵ – all vars. are feminine and in group-writing typical (albeit not in absolute terms) of loans – „hand“ (Černý 1958, 212, #10; CED 340) = „Hand(rücken)“ (GHWb 870) = „back of the hand“ (DLE IV 28) > Dem. ḡḏ ~ ḡḏ ~ kḡḏ „Hand“ (DG 595:4) > Cpt. (SALF) 𐩦𐩣𐩪, (BF) 𐩦𐩣𐩪, (F) 𐩦𐩣𐩪𐩪,¹³⁶ (pBodmer VI) 𐩦𐩣𐩪, (MF) 𐩦𐩣𐩪 (f) „Hand, Vorderfuß (bei Tieren), Handvoll (als Maß), Handgriff, Bügel, Handarbeit, Tätigkeit, Führung, Handschrift“ (KHW 472): as an anatomical term, i.e., part of the core lexicon (not typical to be borrowed), it must be rather an item of the *Volkssprache* with no Older Egyptian etymon attested in written form (henceforth, with no graphemic tradition) prior to the New Kingdom, which is why syllabic orthography was applied here. V. Blažek (1990, 30; 1991, 210) affiliated it with NOM. *k^wiCi „5“ [Blz.] and NOM. *√kč „pyka“ [IS 1971, #80] = *kuc-/kis- „hand or arm“ [Bnd.-Flm. 1976, 38] = *kuc „hand“ [Bnd. 1988, 147]. This correspondence may be correct provided the C₂ of the Omotic root was a glottal affricate.

¹²⁸ Yeivin 1932, 73, fn. 6; Bomhard 1984, 218 V. Blažek 1989 MS Om., 16, #52 also NOM.: Janjero zerum „hand“ and some Chadic forms.

¹²⁹ Where, by the way, one would expect a reflex like **z3^c > *z3ḥ (for the shift of *^c > ḥ in the proximity of dentals see EDE I 326-7).

¹³⁰ Sem.: Ar. ṭarr-at- „flank“ || SBrb. (Tuareg) a-ḡer „leg“ || LECu.: Somali ḡarór-ayya „to bank up“ || WCh.: Hausa caaráá „to arrange“.

¹³¹ His two pieces of “evidence” (namely Mehri qôn “Horn” < *√qrn and Aram. y-ḥāk “er geht” < *√hlk), however, do not prove a bit about his *ad hoc* supposition about the alleged loss of *-r- in Akkadian.

¹³² An apparent cognate appears in LECu.: Galab ḡfl, pl. ḡill-ù “hand” [Sasse 1974, 416], which – as I have demonstrated it elsewhere (Takács 2011, 148-150) – speaks in favour of an AA *γ in this root, i.e., AA *√γl „hand“ [GT] as it had long been surmised by W. Vycichl (1934, 69, 84; 1951, 68).

¹³³ Attested in the Leipzig NK stela no. 122, in a (fem.?) PN ḡm-ḡḏ „one with a tender hand“, recorded in PN I 215:20 and by Spiegelberg in his KHW 212, n. 12.

¹³⁴ Occurs in pTorino 1984, vs. 20-21, in the enumeration of body parts listed between ḡrt „hand“ and k3p „hollow of the hand“, which led J. Černý (l.c.) to assuming our word to be „in the XXIInd Dynasty not quite synonymous with ḡrt as the meaning of [ij] might lead us to believe“.

¹³⁵ Cf. pBM 10252 (Urk. VI 83:6): t3j=k ḡḏ 2, rendered by ḡrt.j=k(j) „your two hands“ in pLouvre 3129.

¹³⁶ Is the additional -h a trace of the AA marker *- of the nominal class of anatomical terminology (described in Takács 1997)?

„Left”

Eg. j3b.j „links, linke Seite, die Linke” (OK-, Wb I 30) > j3b.t „1. linke Seite, 2. Osten” (OK-, Wb I 30, 14-15): its etymology has not yet been definitely settled due to the plurality of attractive solutions:

(1) F. Hommel (1894, 346, 1904, 109), followed by G.R. Castellino (1984, 17), surmised here an old loan-word from Sumerian gùb, but Hommel’s supposition on the Sumerian term becoming „*später etwa jib*” as well as the lack of reflection (or source?) of the Eg. -3- in Sumerian hinder such an equation.

(2) W. Vycichl (1990, 91) affiliated it with Sem.: Ar. waʔaba and yaʔiba „avoir honte, être en colère” arguing that „*la main gauche*” was „*considérée comme étant de mauvaise augure, avec la quelle on ne mange pas et qu’on ne tend pas aux amis*”. Phonologically possible, albeit semantically far-fetched.

(3) H.G. Mukarovsky (1994, 148) found surprising correspondences in the languages of Central Chadic, where a proto-form *ʒaḃ(a) „zur linken Hand” > „Norden” [GT]¹³⁷ emerges in the Higi and Mandara groups with a variety *laḃ-, which may regularly be traced back to an older **laʔb-, i.e., a proto-form fully plausible for Eg. √j3b too. Similarly, V. Orel and O. Stolbova (1992, 200; HSED #1821) compared Eg. j3bj with WCh.: Seya (Zar) nàḃi „left” [Krf. 1981, #330], which is perhaps the reflex of the same **laʔb-. But their supposition on an eventual etymological link to AA *li/ub- „heart” [OS] is dubious because of the anomaly of *-ḃ- in root for „left” vs. *-b- in that of „heart”.

(4) H.G. Mukarovsky (1994, 152, §4.2) suggested, at the same time, a semantically possible¹³⁸ cognacy with NAgaw: Bilin aréḃā „schwarz”, which is, however, phonologically dubious.¹³⁹

(5) Another path has been opened by C.T. Hodge (1966, 44, #9; 1968, 26, #50; 1981, 375) pointing to a possible connection to WCh.: Hausa ʔárèwáá „northwards” [Abr. 1962, 36] (actually *,to the left”), but whether Eg. -ḃ- and Hausa -w- can be equated is obscure.

(6) In my opinion, the root meaning of Eg. *√j3b might be better understood in the light of Eg. j3b „(Adjektiv und Verbum übler Bedeutung) vom Geruch der Leiche” (OK, Wb I 29, 19) = „übel riechen, krank sein” (NBÄ 84) = „übelriechend, stinkend sein” (GHWb 24), hence *jĕ/ĭ3b.Ůt „Krankheit u.ä.” (NBÄ) > Cpt. (S) **ΕΙΛ(Λ)ΒΕ**, (B) **ΙΛΒΙ**, (F) **ΙΕ(Ε)ΒΙ** (f) „Eiter, Krankheit” (NBÄ 84, 423, n. 94, 427, n. 97), for which

¹³⁷ Cf. Higi group: Higi-Nkafa làḃà „Norden”, Higi-Baza laḃà „Norden”, Higi-Futu ʒăḃ<w „Norden”, Fali-Gili ʒăḃe „links” | Mandara group: Mandara (Wandala) năḃḃà „links”, Dghwede (Zeghvana) ðivu ʒaḃa „links” (cf. *ḃib- „Hand”), Glavda ðivà ʔyeḃa „links, Norden”, Guduf-Gava ñtu ðivà yaḃà „links” (cf. ðivà „Hand”), Glavda-Nakatsa ñdivà ʔyeḃá „links” (cf. *ḃiv- „hand”) | Daba ʒăḃəy „right” (CCh. data: Krf. 1981, #330-331).

¹³⁸ Cf. Ar. šuʔm- „malheur, infortune, adversité, 2. malheureux, 3. (qui est à) gauche, 4. (pl.) Noirs (en parlant des chameaux)” [BK I 1179].

¹³⁹ L. Reinisch (1887, 47) has Agaw (sic) arāb “schwarz, blau sein” corresponding to LECu.: Saho ôrbá ~ wârbá „schwarz gefleckte Kuh” [Rn.], which he affiliated with Sem. *√γrb „untergehen (die Sonne), finster werden”. Nevertheless, a cognacy is by far not evident either semantically or phonologically. As I pointed out elsewhere (Takács 2011, 139-154), the regular match of Sem. *γ would be ECU. *g.

highly noteworthy is Ar. $\sqrt{\text{rb}}$: I ʔariba „1. être dans la misère, 2. avoir besoin de qqch., 4. être dur, difficile, défavorable (se dit des temps, du sort), 5. se sentir faible, flâche, sans vigueur”, ʔurb- „1. malheur, infortune, adversité, 2. scrupule” [BK I 22-23]. An Egypto-Semitic root?

Eg. smḥ.j „links (Adj.), die Linke (Subst.)” (NE, Wb IV 140) = „left (side, hand, arm)” (DLE III 53) has always been *unisono*¹⁴⁰ combined with Sem. *šaʔmal- „sinistro, mano sinistra” [Frz.] = *šVm(?)Vl- [Mlt.],¹⁴¹ although this equation is surrounded by a number of puzzles. Although – except for the -m- – neither of the radicals in fact display any regular correspondence, let alone that of Eg. -mḥ- vs. Sem. *ʔml- , which has never been elucidated satisfactorily.¹⁴² As the evidence of Ar. $\sqrt{\text{šʔm}}$ indicates¹⁴³ and as A. Ember (1926, 312, #7) rightly stated, the Semitic stem might be segmented into *šaʔm- + *al- , a „secondary addition”.¹⁴⁴ This opinion has been expressed also in the work by S.S. Majzel’ and A.Ju. Militarev (1983, 236), who, however, mistakenly supposed a quite different original sense.¹⁴⁵ F. von Calice (GÄSW 197-8, #809) saw in both Sem. *šaʔmal- and Eg. smḥ.j „verschiedene Weiterbildungen einer Wurzel šm (sic), die aber nicht der Urschicht angehören können, da das s im Ägyptischen westsemitischen Lautstand zeigt”. Nevertheless, Eg. smḥ.j can by no means be regarded as a loan from Canaanite (or whatsoever) due to the differing C_3 in Egyptian, which may not be explained the same way as Sem. *al- . Is it identical with the suffix -ḥ occurring in Egyptian

¹⁴⁰ Erman 1892, 119; Holma 1911, x, Ember 1926, 312, #7; Farina 1926, 20; GÄSW 197-8, #809. Nevertheless, W.A. Ward (1961, 38, #21) remarked that the Semitic word „doesn’t appear in Eg. or Dem.”, just on a Coptic ostrakon as smoul “left/east (?)” (CD 565b), which is evidently a Semitic loan.

¹⁴¹ Attested in Akk. šumēlu “Linke: 1. linke Seite, 2. linke Hand” [AHW 1271] || Ug. šmāl “die/das Linke” [WUS], Hbr. šemo(?)l „die linke Seite, 2. Norden, Nordseite” [GB] | Ar. šamʔal- „linke Seite, Norden” [Erman] || MSA: Jibbali šamlī (m), šamlēt (f) „left” [Jns. 1981, 253], Mehri šáymāl/šəmwəl „left (hand)” [Jns. 1987, 380], Soqotri šimhīl ~ šémhēl ~ šémeḷ „gauche” [Lsl.] etc. (Sem.: GB 787; Leslau 1938, 430; WUS 307, #2622; Fronzaroli 1965, 265, #4.27; MM 1983, 236; Kogan 1995, 158).

¹⁴² A. Ember (l.c. supra) assumed an irreal chain of smḥ.j (sic, -ḥ-) < *šmhj < *šm3j without any comparative evidence. The only way out to explain this anomalous match would be assuming an equally striking connection between Eg. mḥ and Sem. *mlʔ „to fill”.

¹⁴³ Cf. stem I: šaʔama „1. être de mauvais augure, sinistre, malencontreux, porter malheur à qqn.”, šuʔima „1. être sinistre, de mauvais augure, porter malheur, 2. être à gauche, se présenter du côté gauche”, šaʔim- „1. (qui est à) gauche, 2. sinistre, de mauvais augure, qui porte malheur, 3. méchant”, šuʔm- „malheur, infortune, adversité, 2. malheureux, 3. (qui est à) gauche” [BK I 1178-9].

¹⁴⁴ Whether CCh.: Fali-Muchella mà-šimbōru „left” [Krf.] is related and whether the same historical analysis can be made here too, is not yet clear (as long as as further Chadic cognates are not at our disposal).

¹⁴⁵ S.S. Majzel’ and A.Ju. Militarev (1983, 236 and fn. 36), followed by A. Gluhak (1987, 163, fn. 11), assumed an etymological connection with Soqotri šéʔemet „courbé, qui penche d’un côté” [Lsl. 1938, 409], but the initial sibilants differ (the term for „left” has š- and lacks -ʔ-). In addition, as W. Leslau (l.c.) points out, the Soqotri term is extended from ʔamt „côté” akin to Geez ʔānta „à côté de, vers” cf. Sem. *ʔamm-at- „Elle” [GT after GB 47; WUS 24, #272; AHW 44] || Eg. jm „1. (OK) ein Körperteil: ob Rippe (?), 2. (XIX.) auch als essbarer Teil einer Gazelle: Rippenstück (?)” (Wb I 77, 16-17) = „side” (FD 17) = „Rippe(nstück)” (ÄWb I 72a) || WCh.: Bade ʔām-šn (f) „Arm (und Hand)” [Lukas 1968, 222], Ngizim ām-āi „arm, hand” [Schuh 1981, 9].

anatomical terms?¹⁴⁶ I.e., do we have here a nisbe of a lost Eg. *smḡ „left side”? On the other hand, the rare, albeit existing irregular correspondence of Eg. s- vs. Sem. *š- is attested.

Dem. gbjr „links” (DG 578:3) > (SL) **ḡBOYP**, (SMF) **ḡBOYP**, (AL) **ḡBIP**, (pBodmer VI) **KBIP** (f) „left hand” (CED 275) = „linke Hand, linke Seite, links” (KHW 446). Its pre-Demotic history is obscure just like its external ties. At the moment just guesses can be made:

(1) W. Vycichl (DELC 336) tried to affiliate it with Sem.: Ar. $\sqrt{\text{gbr}}$ I „1. panser, bander et remboîter, remettre (un os démis, cassé), 3. forcer, contraindre à qqch.” [BK I 247]. Semantically far-fetched.

(2) A comparison with Sem. * $\sqrt{\text{grb}}$ „north” [GT]¹⁴⁷ would be not better either because of the metathesis, although the association between „left” and „north” is well attested both in Semitic and Chadic (instances above).

(3) From a phonological viewpoint, it is still difficult to understand whether and – if yes – how LEg. *gābīr might be related to ECu. *gur- „left” [GT]¹⁴⁸ (which was borrowed into Ethio-Semitic)¹⁴⁹ III CCh. *g^(w)ur- „left” [GT].¹⁵⁰ This would only be possible if we assume an earlier Eg. **gwr, for which we only have scanty support.¹⁵¹

„Right”

Eg. jmn „rechts (Adj.), rechte Seite (Subst.)” (PT-, Wb I 85, 11-14) > jmn.t „rechte Seite, Westen” (OK-, Wb I 86) is evidently cognate with Sem. *yamin- „destro, mano

¹⁴⁶ For a thorough analysis of this nominal class indicator in all related branches of the AA family see Takács 1997.

¹⁴⁷ Aram. (Palmyra) grby „septentrional” [DRS], JPArām. garbitā „(vent) du nord” [DRS], Syr. garbāyā „(vent) du nord” [DRS], Mandaic (from Ar.) girb(i)ā „north (wind)” [DM 1963, 92] | Ar. ġirbiyy- „septentrional, le nord terrestre” [Blachère 1398] (Sem.: DRS 178).

¹⁴⁸ Attested in LECu.: Saho ġūrā „die linke Hand, Seite” [Rn. 1890, 161], Afar ġūra „left (hand)” [PH 1985, 117], Rendille ġúrro „1. left (as opposed to right), 2. south(ern)” [PG 1999, 130] | HECu.: Kambatta gura-ta „left (side)”, gur-ču „left-handed (person)”, Sidamo gura „left (side)”, gura-ččo „left-handed (person)” (HECu.: Hudson 1989, 90).

¹⁴⁹ As suggested by E. Cerulli (1936, 204), cf. Tigrinya ġəraw „left-handed”, Gurage *gura „left (direction)”, ancient Harari gura, Amharic and Argobba ġəra, Gafat ġəra „left” (ES: Leslau 1979 III 288-9). By the way, W. Leslau (1956, 203) erroneously suggested a derivation from Sem. * $\sqrt{\text{yrb}}$ „to set (of sun)” becoming in his view gr with the loss of -b under Cushitic influence.

¹⁵⁰ Cf. Higi-Kamale (kw)ḡwùlā „left” [Krf.] | Lame bà-ḡūrū „left” [Krf.], Lame-Peve ɓa-gur „left” [Krf.], Zime-Batna ġūrā „gauche” [Scn. 1982, 498], Misme (Zime) gour „left” [Krf.] (Ch.: Krf. 1981, #330; Stl. 1996, 67). The reconstruction of PCh. *gulu/a „left” [Stl. l.c.] is not corroborated by the inner and external evidence.

¹⁵¹ Cf. Cpt. (S) λΩΒΩ „to be hot, glow” (CD 137b), which J. Černý (CED 70) derived from Eg. nwh „1. verbrannt, versengt werden, 2. sich erwärmen, kochen” (CT, Med., XIX., Wb II 224, 10-12), but at the same time J. Osing (NBÄ 244, 814, n. 1062, cf. KHW 514) preferred to take it from Eg. 3bḡ „verbrennen” (CT VII 263c, GHWb 7; ÄWb II 12c), although the latter etymon has recently been rendered „to join” (AECT III 129, spell 1033) = „to unite” (DCT 3). Cf. also SBrb.: Ayř ə-lbəḡ „se réchauffer, se rallumer (dispute)” [PAM 2003, 447].

destra” [Frz. 1965, 265, #4.26] = *yamīn- „правый, южный” [Djk., Hodge].¹⁵² The Sem.-Eg. match has been usually extended to WCh.: Hausa yammáa „westwards” [Abr. 1962, 944],¹⁵³ which might only be accepted provided this form were assimilated from *yamn-, for which I see no proof.¹⁵⁴ Otherwise hardly, as the segmentation *yam- + *-īn-¹⁵⁵ seems unlikely. On the contrary, if one is to isolate here the ultimate biconsonantal root (if any), it is the first radical that might well turn out to be a *y- *mobile*, cf. AA *√mn „right” [GT] > NOm.: Sezo 1 mǎnné, 2 mǎni „right (side)” [Sbr.-Wdk. 1994, 15] ||| WCh.: Maha monay „right (side)” [Nwm. 1965, 58, #89]. Or should we assume here a metathesis of the AA root varieties *√ymn ~ *√mny? In any case, Eg. jmn finds its closest match in Sem. *√ymn.

Eg. wnm.j „rechts (Adj.), rechte Seite (Subst.)” (OK-, Wb I 322, 1-12), actually *wǝnǝm.j in the light of Cpt. (S) **ⲟⲩⲛⲁⲙ**. In spite of its misleading similarity, an alleged connection to Eg. jmn is excluded.¹⁵⁶ Most probably we are dealing here with an inner Egyptian innovation. F.L. Griffith (1898, 60) was the first to point out a possible derivation from Eg. wnm „eat”, which was later corroborated by W. Vycichl (1959, 71; 1972, 178) rendering the right hand as „Eß-Hand” or „celle qui mange” in the light of numerous parallels in the African languages, cf. CCh.: Logone zēm „manger” zēmi „main droite”,¹⁵⁷

¹⁵² See Stern in ZÄS 22 (1884), 74, fn. 1; Erman 1892, 107; Hommel 1894, 345, n. ***; Jahn 1906, 377, fn. 1; Holma 1911, x; Farina 1924, 316, 318; 1926, 13, 21; ESS §4.b.8 and §10.a.3; GÄSW #8; Vycichl 1958, 376; D’jakonov 1965, 47; Hodge 1976, 12, #48; 1977, 933; 1981, 404. F. Hommel (1904, 117-8, fn. 2) surprisingly changed his mind and explained Eg. jmn as the „*ältere Form*” of wnm (sic, for wnm.j) „rechts”, which, in turn, he derived from hnm.w „*widderköpfig wie ... Amon*” implying an ultimate kinship with the theonym jmn „*Amon*”!

¹⁵³ See Vycichl 1934; Vergote 1945, 131, §2.a.2; Cohen 1947, #495; Pilszczikowa 1960, 123, #126; Olderogge 1960, 800; D’jakonov 1967, 187; Mukarovskij 1994, 146. The meaning „Westen, Abend” associated to the Hausa word by J. Vergote (l.c.) is false. Similarly, M. Cohen (uncritically followed by N. Pilszczikowa, l.c. *supra*) misquoted Hausa yamma „right” (sic), which was disproved by D. Ol’derogge (1952, 34 and fn. 27) pointing to the fact that for that notion Hausa has a different word, viz. dáámá „right (hand, side)” [Abr. 1962, 178].

¹⁵⁴ Let alone that no further parallels from the Chadic daughter languages are known to corroborate such a historical reconstruction.

¹⁵⁵ N. Skinner (1995, 34) affiliated the Egypto-Semitic and Hausa isogloss with Sem. *yamm- „sea” (> LEg. jm) and Cu. *yam(m)- „water, river”! This suggestion, not argued for by Skinner, remains baseless. How to render the signification of the C₃ in Sem. *√ymn?

¹⁵⁶ F. Hommel (1904, 117-8, fn. 2) assumed in Eg. √wnm the older form of √jmn and then eventually took both words from hnm.w „Chnum”! W.F. Albright (1923, 67) too related both roots via a „*transposition of m and n*”.

¹⁵⁷ This term is cognate to a number parallel expressions for „right”, cf. WCh.: SBauchi *šəm- (or sim.) [GT]: Dira (Zul) šumli, Burma nē-šipi, Geji à-šinti, Buli a-šām, Dwot to-šim, Polchi šimli || CCh.: PTera *səm- (or sim.) [GT]: Pidlimdi zuma, Hwona yi-sumà, Ga’anda hær-sum, Gabin hær-kà-sim, Boka hær-simta | Bura-Margi *zum- (or sim.) [GT]: Bura ma-zum, Chibak tsi-sumæ?, WMargi če-suma?, če-suma, Ngwahyi ti-simà, Kilba čāsúm, Hyildi mā-zumu, Wamdiu màn-zum, Margi tsi-sim | PHigi *zum- (or sim.) [GT]: Higi-Kamale kwa-zùmè, Higi-Ghye wa-sùmè, Higi-Futu kwa-zùmù, Fali-Kiria man-zum, Fali-Gili kwò-mbùzùmwt, Fali-Jilbu mà-zùmì | PBata *zum- (or sim.) [GT]: Gude (dà) čì-zuman, Nzangi (Njanye) a-zime, Mwulyen wà-dí-zùmàn, Bachama zùmey, Gudu wàà-zím | Hina sēm (Chadic data quoted from Kraft 1981 I-III, #329, except for Hina quoted from Strümpell 1922-3, 122). The underlying root may be identical to PCh *√zm „to eat” [JI 1994 I 56B].

Ful nyāmo „droite” < nyām- „1. manger, 2. viande”, Ewhe ɖu „manger” → nu-ɖu-si „main pour manger → droite”, Swahili kula „manger” ~ mkono wa kulia „la main pour manger = main droite”. One might add that WCh.: Ngizim mà-tá „right (hand)” also derives from táu „to eat” (which is akin, by the way, to Sem. * $\sqrt{\text{twy}}$ „to eat”). All other suggestions on the origin of Eg. wnm.j¹⁵⁸ are, therefore, to be considered with much more reservation.

Directions

D. Olderogge (1960, 800) critically – and rightly – assessed K. Sethe’s hypothesis on an Asiatic origin of ancient Egyptians, whose ancestors – in the latter’s view – had penetrated into the Nile Valley from the North Delta and moved up the river facing the south with the west on the right side. But as the Russian Africanist argued, in those predynastic times, when the Proto-Egyptians are supposed to have invaded the Delta, it was merely a swamp impossible to open up. Is it necessary at all to identify the northern orientation with the supposed direction of the wandering? For Proto-Egyptians, such a point of orientation must have been the supposed source of Nile. This must be the reason why the notion „South” may have originated in the primary sense „head”¹⁵⁹, whereas that for „North” may be associated with „back”.¹⁶⁰

Synopsis

meaning	Semitic cognacy	„African” origin	Egyptian innovation
hair	sr, f ^c 3	šn and šntj	
head	d3d3	tp	
brain	3js, ʿmm	tbn	

¹⁵⁸ There are a few further tempting solutions. (1) V. Orel and O. Stolbova (1992, 201; cf. also Orel 1995, 127, #53; HSED #2522) equated Eg. wnm.j with the apparently isolated ECh.: Kabalay uólema „rechts” [Lukas 1937, 93], which Orel took from a Nostratic *wal(e)m- „right (side)”. Naturally, one would need much more Chadic data before venturing such a daring reconstruction. (2) With regard to the association of the notions „right” vs. „direct”, an etymological link to NBrb.: Tamazight $\sqrt{\text{nm}}$: nem „être droit, direct, (re)dressé” [Taïfi 1991, 491] might in principle be conceivable (assuming a w- *mobile* in Egyptian). (3) Even less probable seems a connection to WCh.: Bade àanəm „south” CCh.: Margi ànim „north”, WMargi bwɔr-ʔànuw anim „south”, Wamdiu ànum „north” | Mandara ʔànum „south”, Glavda (Ch.: Kraft 1981).

¹⁵⁹ Eg. rs.w “der Süden” (OK-, WB II 453) > (SBA) PHC, rendered by W.F. Albright literally as *,what belongs to the head-waters (of the Nile)”, has been usually affiliated with Sem. *raʔš- „head” (cf. Hommel 1894, 345-6; Müller 1909, 188, fn. 3; Holma 1911, x, 10; 1919, 39; Ember 1918, 31; Albright 1918, 90; 1923, 67; Farina 1924, 314, 324; ESS §12.a.24; GÄSW 27, #20).

¹⁶⁰ For Eg. mh.w „Unterägypten” (OK-, Wb II 123) cf. AA * $\sqrt{\text{m[h]}}$ „back, bottom” (discussed in EDE III 478, #3).

meaning	Semitic cognacy	„African” origin	Egyptian innovation
temple	ssk3	m3 ^ʕ , gm3, sm3	
ear	*jdn	ʕnh and msdr (?)	msdr (?)
eye	*ʕn	jr.t	b33, mr.t (?)
nose	fnd (?)	šr.t	
tooth	jbh (?)	nhd.t, tz.(t)	
tongue		ns, sn.w, nt	
lung	zm3	wf3	
heart	jb	jdr	h3.tj
hand	*d	d3.t ~ dr.t and gd	
left	smh.j (?)	*gbr.j	j3b.j
right	jmj.j		wnm.j

Conclusion

As we can see from the synopsis, the core lexicon of anatomical terminology, in its not insignificant part, is in fact a mostly binary (or sometimes triadic) system of synonyms, which have either Semitic cognacy or an African (non-Semitic) etymological background in its origins. Sometimes – as normally it is the case in the history of a language – an inner Egyptian innovation also appears as a third synonym. It is also apparent from the table above by what degree Semitic words are outnumbered in this domain as compared to those attested only in the African branches. What is more, scanning through – etymologically – all basic terms for „tongue” and „throat” (quite numerous, in addition), we have to state that none of them were Semitic. This seems to betray, at least in the examined field of human anatomy, a deeper presence of the extra-Semitic vocabulary in Egyptian, where the equivalent Semitic components may have perhaps been due to a subsequent *cohabitation*. The subsequent parts of this series are planned to survey the rest of anatomical terminology and numerals.

Abbreviations of author names

Abr.: Abraham, Alb.: Albright, Alm.: Alemayehu, AMS: Amborn, Minker, Sasse, Apl.: Appleyard, Ast.: Aistleitner, BK: Biberstein Kazimirsky, Blv.: Belova, Blz.: Blažek, Bmh.: Bomhard, Bnd.: Bender, Brg.: Bargery, Brk.: Brockelmann, Brt.: Barreteau, Bst.: Basset, CR: Conti Rossini, Crl.: Cerulli, Csp.: Cosper, Dbr.-Mnt.: Djibrine & Montgolfier, Djk.: D'jakonov, Dkl.: Diyakal, Dlg.: Dolgopolskij, Dlh.: Delheure, Dlt.: Dallet, Dst.: Destaing, Ebs.: Ebobisse, EEN: Ehret, Elderkin, Nurse, Eld.: Elderkin, Fcd.: Foucauld,

Flk.: Foulkes, Flm.: Fleming, Frj.: Frajzyngier, Frz.: Fronzaroli, Ftp.: Fitzpatrick, Gcl.: Gochal, Grb.: Greenberg, GT: Takács, Hds.: Hudson, Hfm.: Hoffmann, Hlw.: Hellwig, IS: Illiĉ-Svityĉ, JI: Jungrathmayr and Ibriszimow, Jng.: Jungrathmayr, KB: Köhler, Baumgartner, KM: Kießling and Mous, Krf.: Kraft, Lmb.: Lamberti, LR: Louali-Raynal, Lsl.: Leslau, Mch.: Mouchet, Mkr.: Mukarovsky, Mlt.: Militarev, MM: Majzel' and Militarev, Mnh.: Meinhof, MSkn.: M. Skinner, Mtl.: Motylinski, Mts.: Matsushita, NM: Newman and Ma, Ncl.: Nicolas, Ntg.: Netting, Nwm.: Newman, Old.: Ol'derogge, OS: Orel and Stolbova, PAM: Prasse, Alojaly, Mohamed, PG: Pillinger and Galboran, PH: Parker and Hayward, Pls.: Pilszczikiwa, Prh.: Porhomovskij, Prs.: Prasse, Prv.: Provotelle, RB: Rapp and Benzing, RK: Reutt & Kogan, Rn.: Reinisch, Rns.: Renisio, Rpr.: Roper, Rsg.: Rossing, Rsl.: Rössler, Sbr.: Siebert, Scn.: Sachnine, Skn.: Skinner, Smz.: Shimizu, Srl.: Sirlinger, Stl.: Stolbova, Str.: Strümpell, Tf.: Täifi, Trb.: Trombetti, Trn.: Tourneux, TSL: Tourneux, Seignobos, Lafarge, Vrg.: Vergote, Vcl.: Vycichl, Wdk.: Wedekind, Wlf.: Wölfel, WP: Weibegué & Palayer, Wtl.: Whiteley, Zbr.: Zaborski, Zhl.: Zyhlarz.

Quoted works

- AÄG = Edel, E.: *Altägyptische Grammatik*. Roma, 1955., Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.
- Abraham, R.C.: *Dictionary of the Hausa Language*.² London, 1962., University of London Press.
- Abraham, R.C.: *Somali-English Dictionary*.² London, 1964., University of London Press Ltd.
- AECT = Faulkner, R.O.: *The Ancient Egyptian Coffin Texts*. Vol. I-III. Warminster, 1973-8., Aris & Phillips Ltd.
- AEO = Gardiner, A.H.: *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica*. I-II. Oxford, 1947., Clarendon Press.
- AEPT = Faulkner, R.O.: *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts*. I. Oxford, 1969., Clarendon Press.
- AHW = Soden, W. von: *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*. I-III. Wiesbaden, 1965-1981., Otto Harrassowitz.
- Aistleitner, J.: *Untersuchungen zum Mitlautbestand des Ugaritisch-Semitischen*. Löwinger, S. & Somogyi, J. (eds.): *Ignace Goldziher Memorial Volume*. Part I. Budapest, 1948., Globus. Pp. 209-225.
- Ajello, R.; Karyo, M.; Melis, A.; Dobio, Ou.: *Lexique comparatif de six langues tchadique central* (Gizey, Ham, Lew, Marba, Masa, Musey). Pisa, 2001., Edizioni Plus, Università di Pisa.
- AL I-III = Meeks, D.: *Année lexicographique. Égypte ancienne*. Tome 1-3 (1977-1979). 2^{ème} édition. Paris, 1998., Cybele.
- Albright, W.F.: *Notes on Egypto-Semitic Etymology*. I.= *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 34/2 (1918), 81-98.
- Albright, W.F.: *Notes on Egypto-Semitic Etymology*. II.= *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 34/4 (1918), 215-255.
- Albright, W.F.: *The Principles of Egyptian Phonological Development*.= *Recueil de Travaux Relatifs à la Philologie et à l'Archéologie Égyptiennes et Assyriennes* 40 (1923), 64-70.
- Albright, W.F.: *Notes on Egypto-Semitic Etymology*. III.= *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 47 (1927), 198-237.
- ALC 1978 = Angas Language Committee (in Cooperation with Nigeria Bible Translation Trust): *Shòk nkari kè shòktok mwa ndən Ngas. Ngas-Hausa-English Dictionary with Appendix Showing Some Features of Ngas Grammar*. Jos, Nigeria, 1978., Nigeria Bible Translation Trust.
- Alemayehu, A.: *Ometo Dialect Survey – A Pilot Study Report*.= *Survey of Little Known Languages of Ethiopia* 4 (1993), 1-10.
- Ali, M. & Zaborski, A.: *Handbook of the Oromo Language*. Wrocław, 1990., Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk.
- Alio, Kh.: *Préliminaires à une étude de la langue kajakse d'Am-Dam, de Toram du Salamaat, d'ubi du Guéra et de masmaje du Batha-est*.= Takács, G. (ed.): *Egyptian and Semito-Hamitic (Afro-Asiatic) Studies in Memoriam Werner Vycichl*. Leiden, 2004., E.J. Brill. Pp. 229-285.
- Allen, J.P.: *Middle Egyptian. An Introduction to the Language and Culture of Hieroglyphs*. Cambridge, 2000., University Press.

- Amborn, H. & Minker, G. & Sasse, H.-J.: *Das Dullay. Materialien zu einer ostkuschitischen Sprachgruppe*. Berlin, 1980., Reimer Verlag.
- Appleyard, D.: *A Comparative Approach to the Amharic Lexicon*.= *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 5/2 (1977).
- Appleyard, D.: *The Internal Classification of the Agaw Languages. A Comparative and Historical Phonology*.= Bynon, J. (ed.): *Current Progress in Afro-Asiatic Linguistics*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 1984., John Benjamins. Pp. 33-67.
- Appleyard, D.: *The Vowel Systems of Agaw: Reconstruction and Historical Inferences*.= *Proceedings of the Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress. Band II*. Wien, 1991., Afro-Pub. Pp. 13-28.
- Appleyard, D.: *A Comparative Dictionary of the Agaw Languages*. Köln, 2006., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- ÄWb I = Hannig, R.: *Ägyptisches Wörterbuch I. Altes Reich und Erste Zwischenzeit*. Hannig-Lexica 4. Mainz am Rhein, 2003., Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- ÄWb II = Hannig, R.: *Ägyptisches Wörterbuch II. Mittleres Reich und Zweite Zwischenzeit. I-II*. Hannig-Lexica 5. Mainz am Rhein, 2006., Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- Backes, B.: *Das ägyptische „Zweiwegebuch“*. Studien zu den Sargtext-Sprüchen 1029-1130. Wiesbaden, 2005., Harrassowitz.
- Bardinet, Th.: *Dents et mâchoires dans les représentations religieuses et la pratique médicale de l'Égypte Ancienne*. Roma, 1990., Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico.
- Bargery, G.P.: *A Hausa-English Dictionary and English-Hausa Vocabulary Compiled for the Government of Nigeria*. London, 1934., Oxford University Press, Humphrey Milford.
- Barguet, P.: *Les textes des sarcophages égyptiens du Moyen Empire*. Paris, 1986., Les Éditions du Cerf.
- Barreteau, D. & Jungrathmayr, H.: *Les verbes monoradicaux dans les langues tchadiques*.= Jungrathmayr, H. & Tourneux, H. (eds.): *Études tchadiques. Verbes monoradicaux suivis d'une note sur la negation en haoussa. Actes de la XIIème réunion de Groupe d'Études Tchadiques LACITO-CNRS-PARIS*. Paris, 1990., Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner. Pp. 37-214.
- Barreteau, D.: *Vowel and Tonal Variations within the Consonantal Framework of the Verbal System in Central Chadic Languages*.= Ibrizimow, D. & Leger, R. (eds.): *Studia Chadica et Hamitosemitica*. Köln, 1995., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag. Pp. 197-228.
- Barreteau, D. & Brunet, A.: *Dictionnaire Mada*. Berlin, 2000., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Basset, A.: *La langue berbère. Morphologie. La verbe: étude de thèmes*. Collection du centenaire de l'Algérie. Paris, 1929., Librairie Ernest Leroux.
- Basset, R.: *Notes de lexicographie berbère*.= *Journal Asiatique*. Ser. VIII, vol. 1/3 (1883), 281-342.
- Basset, R.: *Notes de lexicographie berbère*.= *Journal Asiatique*. Ser. VIII, vol. 10 (1887), 365-464.
- Basset, R.: *Mission au Sénégal. Tome I. Étude sur le dialecte zenaga*. Paris, 1909., Ernest Leroux.
- Bates, O.: *The Eastern Libyans*. London, 1914., Frank Cass & Co. Ltd.
- BED = Anonymous: *Bura-English Dictionary*. (Place unknown), 1953., (publisher unnamed). Master copy in the library of the Seminar für Afrikanische Sprachen und Kulturen der Universität Hamburg (inv. no.: 15 748 / JT 1526).
- Behrens, P.: *Review of Vycichl, W.: Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue copte*.= *Enchoria* 15 (1987), 237-245.
- Behnk, F.: *Über die Beziehungen des Ägyptischen zu den hamitischen Sprachen*.= *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 82 (1928), 136-141.
- Belova, A.G.: *Refleksy semitskih sibiljantov v drevneegipetskom*.= *Meroé* 4 (1989), 9-21.
- Belova, A.G.: *Struktura semitskogo kornja i semitskaja morfoložičeskaja sistema*.= *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 1 (1991), 79-90.
- Belova, A.G.: *Sur la reconstruction du vocalisme afroasiatique: quelques correspondances égypto-sémitiques*.= Mukarovsky, H.G. (ed.): *Proceedings of the Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress. Band II*. Wien, 1991., Afro-Pub. Pp. 85-93.
- Belova, A.G.: *La structure de la racine afroasiatique. Le cas d'extension phonétique*.= Ebermann, E. & Sommerauer, E.R. & Thomanek, K.É. (eds.): *Komparative Afrikanistik: Sprach-, geschichts- und*

- literaturwissenschaftliche Aufsätze zu Ehren von Hans G. Mukarovsky anlässlich seines 70. Geburtstags. Wien, 1992., Afro-Pub. Pp. 15-20.
- Belova, A.G.: K voprosu o rekonstrukcii semitskogo kornevogo vokalizma.= Voprosy Jazykoznanija 6 (1993), 28-56.
- Belova, A.; Homburg, J.; Kogan, L.; Kovalev, A.; Longinov, J.; Militarev, A. and others: Semitic Anatomic Lexicon. Body Parts. MS. Paper presented at the 6th International Hamito-Semitic Congress, Moscow, April 1994. 3 p.
- Belova, A.G.: Komplementy i struktura kornja v afrazijskom. MS. Moskva, 1995. Still unpublished.
- Belova, A.G.: Omonimija v arabskom korneslove i struktura semitskogo kornja.= Jazyki Azii i Afriki: tradicii, sovremennoe sostojanie i perspektivy issledovanij. Materialy konferencii (5-8 oktjabrja 1998 g.). Moskva, 1998., Rossijskaja Akademija Nauk, Institut Vostokovedenija. Pp. 11-15.
- Bender, M.L.: The Languages of Ethiopia. A New Lexicostatistic Classification and Some Problems of Diffusion.= Anthropological Linguistics 13/5 (1971), 165-288.
- Bender, M.L.: Omotic: A New Afroasiatic Language Family. Carbondale, Illinois, 1975., Southern Illinois University.
- Bender, M.L. & Fleming, H.C.: Non-Semitic Languages.= Bender, M.L.; Bowen, J.D.; Cooper, R.L.; Ferguson, C.A. (eds.): Language in Ethiopia. London, 1976., Oxford University Press. Pp. 34-58.
- Bender, M.L.: Proto-Omotic Phonology and Lexicon.= Bechhaus-Gerst, M.; Serzisko, F. (eds.): Cushitic-Omotic. Papers from the First International Symposium on Cushitic and Omotic Languages, Cologne, January 6-9, 1986. Hamburg, 1988., Helmut Buske Verlag. Pp. 121-159.
- Bender, M.L.: Aroid (South Omotic) Lexicon.= Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere 38 (1994), 133-162.
- Bender, M.L.: The Mystery Languages of Ethiopia.= Marcus, H. (ed.): New Trends in Ethiopian Studies. Vol. 1. Lawrenceville, 1994., Red Sea Press. Pp. 1153-1174.
- Bender, M.L.: Omotic Lexicon and Phonology. Carbondale, 2003., SIU Printing / Duplicating, Southern Illinois University.
- Bender, M.L.: The East Sudanic Languages: Lexicon and Phonology. Carbondale, 2005., SIU Printing / Duplicating, Southern Illinois University.
- Biberstein Kazimirski, A. de: Dictionnaire arabe-français. Paris, 1860., Maisonneuve & Co. Editeurs.
- Bidoli, D.: Die Sprüche der Fangnetze in den altägyptischen Sargtexten. Glückstadt, 1976., J.J. Augustin.
- Birru, T. & Adal, Z. & Cowley, R. W.: The Kunfāl People and Their Language.= Journal of Ethiopian Studies 9/2 (1971), 99-106.
- Blažek, V.: Omotic Lexicon in Afroasiatic Perspective: Body Parts Cognates. MS. Paper presented at the 2nd International Symposium on Cushitic and Omotic Languages (Torino, November 1989). 41 p.
- Blažek, V.: A Comparative-Etymological Approach to Afrasian Numerals.= Proceedings of the Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress. Vol. I. Vienna, 1990., Afro-Pub. Pp. 29-44.
- Blažek, V.: The Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress (Vienna, 28 September – 2 October 1987).= Asian and African Studies 26 (1991), 201-210.
- Blažek, V.: Kartvelian Material in Nostratic Lexicon.= Archív Orientální 59 (1991), 360-369.
- Blažek, V.: Kartvelian Material in Nostratic Lexicon: New Etymologies II.= Shevoroshkin, V. (ed.): Nostratic, Dene-Caucasian, Austric and Amerind. Bochum, 1992., Brockmeyer. Pp. 129-148.
- Blažek, V.: Emotions in Nostratic Lexicon.= Sborník Prací Filozofické Fakulty Brněnské Univerzity. Řada Jazykovědná 40 (1992), 135-146.
- Blažek, V.: The New Dravidian-Afroasiatic Parallels. Preliminary Report.= Shevoroshkin, V. (ed.): Nostratic, Dene-Caucasian, Austric and Amerind. Bochum, 1992., Brockmeyer. Pp. 150-165.
- Blažek, V.: Review of Baldi, Ph. (ed.): Linguistic Change and Reconstruction Methodology.= Archív Orientální 62/1 (1994), 99-103.
- Blažek, V.: Review of Kaye, A. S. (ed.): Semitic Studies in Honour of Wolf Leslau.= Archív Orientální 62 (1994), 428-435.
- Blažek, V.: Toward the Position of Bed'awye within Afroasiatic. An Analysis of the Body Parts Terminology. MS. Printout in Köln, March 1994. 49 p.

- Blažek, V.: Elam: A Bridge between Ancient Near East and Dravidian India? MS. Paper presented at the 3rd World Archaeological Congress, New Delhi, December 1994. 26 p.
- Blažek, V.: Militarev, A. & Kogan, L.: Semitic Etymological Dictionary I. Review Article.= *Archív Orientální* 69 (2001), 495-510.
- Bliese, L., Afar.= Bender, M.L. (ed.): *The Non-Semitic Languages of Ethiopia*. East Lansing, Michigan, 1976., Michigan State University. Pp. 133-165.
- Bomhard, A.R.: *Toward Proto-Nostratic*. Amsterdam, 1984., John Benjamins.
- Bomhard, A.R.: *Common Indo-European/Afroasiatic Roots*. Supplement 1.= *General Linguistics* 26 (1986), 225-257.
- Bondi, J.H.: Die Bezeichnung der ägyptischen Spanne.= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 32 (1894), 132-133.
- Borghouts, J.F.: *The Magical Texts of the Papyrus Leiden I* 348. Leiden, 1971., E.J. Brill.
- Borghouts, J.F.: *Lexicographical Aspects of Magical Texts*.= Grunert, S. & Hafemann, I. (eds.): *Textcorpus und Wörterbuch. Aspekte zur ägyptischen Lexikographie*. Leiden, 1999., E.J. Brill. Pp. 149-177.
- Brockelmann, C.: *Lexicon syriacum*². Halle, 1928., Max Niemeyer.
- Brockelmann, C.: Ägyptisch-semitische Etymologien.= *Zeitschrift für Semitistik* 8 (1932), 97-117.
- Brunner, L.: *Die gemeinsamen Wurzeln des semitischen und indogermanischen Wortschatzen. Versuch einer Etymologie*. Bern, 1969., Francke Verlag.
- Büchner, H.: *Vokabulare des Sprachen in und um Gava (Nordnigerien)*.= *Afrika und Übersee* 48 (1964), 36-45.
- Bynon, J.: *Berber and Chadic. The Lexical Evidence*.= Bynon, J. (ed.): *Current Progress in Afro-Asiatic Linguistics*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 1984., John Benjamins. Pp. 241-290.
- CAD = *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Vol. 1-21. Glückstadt & Chicago, Since 1956, J. J. Augustin, The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- Calice, F. von: *Zur Entwicklung des U-Lautes im Ägyptischen und Koptischen*.= *ZÄS* 63 (1928), 141-143.
- Calice, F. von: *Über semitisch-ägyptische Sprachvergleiche*.= *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 85 (1931), 25-37.
- Calice, F. von: *Grundlagen der ägyptisch-semitischen Wortvergleiche*. Wien, 1936., Selbstverlag des Orientalischen Institutes der Universität Wien.
- Cannuyer, Ch.: *Les formes dérivées du verbe en ancien égyptien. Essai de systématisation*.= *GM* 63 (1983), 25-33.
- Cauville, S.: *Un préfixe p en égyptien?*= *Revue d'Égyptologie* 38 (1987), 183-184.
- CD = Crum, W. E.: *A Coptic Dictionary*. Oxford, 1939., Oxford University Press.
- CED = Černý, J.: *Coptic Etymological Dictionary*. London, Cambridge, 1976., Cambridge University Press.
- Černý, J.: *Some Coptic Etymologies III*.= *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 57 (1958), 203-213.
- Ceulli, E.: *Note su alcune popolazioni sidāmā dell'Abissinia meridionale II: i Sidama dell'Omo*.= *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 12 (1929), 1-69.
- Cerulli, E.: *Studi etiopici. I. La lingua e la storia di Harar*. Roma, 1936., Istituto per l'Oriente.
- Cerulli, E.: *Studi etiopici. II. La lingua e la storia dei Sidamo*. Roma, 1938., Istituto per l'Oriente.
- Cerulli, E.: *Studi etiopici. III. Il linguaggio dei Giangerò ed alcune lingue Sidama dell'Omo (Basketo, Ciara, Zaisse)*. Roma, 1938., Istituto per l'Oriente.
- Cerulli, E.: *Studi etiopici. IV. La lingua caffina*. Roma, 1951., Istituto per l'Oriente.
- Cohen, M.: *Essai comparatif sur le vocabulaire et la phonétique du chamito-sémitique*. Paris, 1947., Librairie Ancienne Honore Champion.
- Conti, G.: *Rapporti tra egiziano e semitico nelle denominazioni egiziane del tetto*.= *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 50/3-4 (1976), 265-273.
- Conti, G.: *Rapporti tra egiziano e semitico nel lessico egiziano dell'agricoltura*. Firenze, 1978., Istituto di Linguistica e di Lingue Orientali, Università di Firenze.

- Conti Rossini, C.: Contributi per la conoscenza della lingua Haruro (Isole del Lago Margherita).= Rendiconti della Reale Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche, Ser. VI, vol. XII, fasc. 7-10 (1937), 621-679.
- Cosper, R.: South Bauchi Lexicon. A Wordlist of Nine South Bauchi (Chadic) Languages and Dialects. Halifax, 1994., The Author (Saint Mary's University).
- CT = Buck, A. de: The Egyptian Coffin Texts. Vol. I-VII. Chicago, 1935-61., The University of Chicago Press.
- Czapkiewicz, A.: Ancient Egyptian and Coptic Elements in the Topography of Contemporary Egypt.= Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, prace językoznawcze, zeszyt 28 (1971).
- Czermak, W.: Die Laute der ägyptischen Sprache. Eine phonetische Untersuchung. I. Teil: Die Laute des Alt- und Mittelägyptischen. Wien, 1931., Verlag der Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Ägyptologen und Afrikanisten in Wien.
- Dallet, J.-M.: Dictionnaire qabyile-français. Parler des At Mangellat (Algerie). Paris, 1982., SELAF (Société d'études linguistiques et anthropologiques de France).
- Dalman, G.H.: Aramäisch-neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud und Midrasch. Frankfurt a/M, 1922., J. Kaufmann Verlag.
- DCT = Molen, R. van der: A Hieroglyphic Dictionary of Egyptian Coffin Texts. Leiden, 2000., E.J. Brill.
- DELIC = Vycichl, W.: Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue copte. Leuven, 1983., Peeters.
- Delheire, J.: Dictionnaire mozabite-français. Paris, 1984., Société d'Études Linguistiques et Anthropologique de France (SELA).
- Destaing, E.: Vocabulaire français-berbère (tachelhit du Soûs). Paris, 1938., Éditions Ernest Leroux.
- DG = Erichsen, W.: Demotisches Glossar. Kopenhagen, 1954., Ejnar Munksgaard.
- Diyakal, Ph.: Mushere-English Dictionary. Collection of words carried out by Mr. Ph. I. D. started on September 10th, 1997 under the supervision of Herrmann Jungraithmayr (Univ. of Frankfurt). MS. 390 p.
- D'jakonov, I.M.: Semitohamitskie jazyki. Opyt klassifikacii. Moskva, 1965., Nauka.
- D'jakonov, I.M.: Jazyki Drevnej Perednej Azii. Moskva, 1967., Nauka.
- Diakonoff, I.M.: Problems of Root Structure in Proto-Semitic.= Archív Orientální 38 (1970), 453-480.
- Diakonoff, I.M.: Hamito-Semitic Languages.= Encyclopaedia Britannica.¹⁵ Macropaedia. Volume 22. Chicago, 1974., The University of Chicago Press. Pp. 740-748.
- Diakonoff, I.M.: Earliest Semites in Asia. Agriculture and Animal Husbandry According to Linguistic Data (VIIIth-IVth Millennia B.C.)= Altorientalische Forschungen 8 (1981), 23-74.
- Diakonoff, I.M.: Letter to the Conference.= Bynon, J. (ed.): Current Progress in Afro-Asiatic Linguistics. Amsterdam, 1984., John Benjamins. Pp. 1-10.
- D'jakonov, I.M.: Obščefrazijskie imennye kategorii.= Pis'mennye pamjatniki i problemy istorii kul'tury narodov Vostoka. XIX godičnaja naučnaja sessija LO IV AN SSSR. Moskva, 1986., Nauka. Pp. 47-62.
- Djibrine, B.A. Z. & Montgolfier, P. de (etc.): Vocabulaire dangaléat. Kawo danja. Place not indicated, around 1973. (deduced by G. Takács), publisher not indicated.
- DLE = Lesko, L.H.: A Dictionary of Late Egyptian. Volume I, II, III, IV. Berkeley, 1982., 1984., 1987., 1989. B.C. Scribe Publications.
- Dolgopolskij, A.B.: Gipoteza drevnejšego rodstva jazykovyh semej severnoj Evrazii s verojatnosnoj točki zrenija.= Voprosy Jazykoznanija 2 (1964), 53-63.
- Dolgopolskij, A.B.: Materialy po sravnitel'no-istoričeskoj fonetike kušitskich jazykov. Gubnye i dental'nye smyčnye v načal'nom položenii.= Uspenskij, B.A. (ed.): Jazyki Afriki. Voprosy struktury, istorii i tipologii. Moskva, 1966., Nauka. Pp. 35-88.
- Dolgopolski, A.B.: A Long-Range Comparison of Some Languages of Northern Eurasia. Problems of Phonetic Correspondences.= VII Meždunarodnyj kongress antropologičeskikh i etnografičeskikh nauk. Moskva, 3-10 avgusta 1964 g. Tom V. Moskva, 1970., Nauka. Pp. 620-628.
- Dolgopolskij, A.B.: Materialy po sravnitel'no-istoričeskoj fonetike kušitskich jazykov. Veljarnyj zvonkij v anlaute.= Ohotina, N.V. & Uspenskij, B.A. (eds.): Problemy afrikanskogo jazykoznanija. Tipologija, komparativistika, opisanie jazykov. Moskva, 1972., Nauka. Pp. 197-216.

- Dolgopolskij, A.B.: *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskaja fonetika kušitskich jazykov*. Moskva, 1973., Nauka.
- Dolgopolsky, A.: Chadic-Semitic-Cushitic: Epenthetic -γ- in Sura in the Light of Hamito-Semitic Comparative Linguistics.= Jungraithmayr, H. (ed.): *The Chad Languages in the Hamitosemitic-Nigritic Boder Area. Papers of the Marburg Symposion* (1979, Berlin). Berlin, 1982., Dietrich Reimer Verlag. Pp. 32-46.
- Dolgopolsky, A.: Semitic and East Cushitic. Sound Correspondences and Cognate Sets.= Segert, S. & Bodrogligeti, A.J.E. (eds.): *Ethiopian Studies Dedicated to Wolf Leslau*. Wiesbaden, 1983., Otto Harrassowitz. Pp. 123-142.
- Dolgopolsky, A.: Semitic Nomina Segolata in Ethiopic.= Goldenberg, G. (ed.): *Ethiopian Studies: Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference*, Tel Aviv, April 1980. Rotterdam, Boston, 1986., Balkema. Pp. 71-90.
- Dolgopolsky, A.: South Cushitic Lateral Consonants as Compared to Semitic and East Cushitic.= Jungraithmayr, H. & Müller, W.W. (eds.): *Proceedings of the Fourth International Hamito-Semitic Congress*. Amsterdam, 1987., John Benjamins. Pp. 195-214.
- Dolgopolsky, A.B.: On Chadic Correspondences of Semitic *š.= Mukarovsky, H.G. (ed.): *Proceedings of the Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress. Band 1*. Wien, 1990., Afro-Pub. Pp. 213-225.
- Dolgopolsky, A.: Some Hamito-Semitic Names of Body Parts" in Goldenberg, G. & Raz, Sh. (eds.): *Semitic and Cushitic Studies*. Wiesbaden, 1994., Otto Harrassowitz. Pp. 267-287.
- Dolgopolsky, A.: On the Origin of Some Semitic Names of Body Parts. Preprint. Haifa, 1994.
- Dolgopolsky, A.: *From Proto-Semitic to Hebrew*. Milano, 1999., CUSCUS.
- Dombrowski, F.A.: *Leo Reinischs materieller Beitrag zur Bedeutung des Agaw, insbesondere des Bilin, für die Erforschung der hamitischen und semitischen Sprachen*.= Mukarovsky, H.G. (ed.): *Leo Reinisch. Werk und Erbe*. Wien, 1987., Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Pp. 107-124.
- Dozy, R.: *Suppléments aux dictionnaires arabes. Tome I-II*. Leiden, Paris, 1881., E.J. Brill, Maisonneuve.
- DRS = Cohen, D.: *Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques ou attestées dans les langues sémitiques. Fascicules 1-2*. Paris & La Haye, 1970-1976., Mouton. Fascicule 3-. Leuven, 1993-, Peeters. With continuous pagination.
- DUL = Olmo Lete, G. & Sanmartín, J.: *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition. Part One [ʔ(a/i/u)-k]. Part Two [l-z]*. Leiden, 2003., E.J. Brill.
- Durand, O.: *Problèmes de lexicologie berbère-sémitique: la berbère préislamique*.= RSO 67 (1993), 229-244.
- Ebert, K.H.: *Sprache und Tradition der Kera (Tschad). Teil II*. Berlin, 1976., Dietrich Reimer.
- Ebert, K.H.: *Lexical Root and Affixes in Kera*.= Caprile, J.-P. & Jungraithmayr, H. (eds.): *Préalables à la reconstruction du proto-tchadique*. Paris, 1978., SELAF. Pp. 41-50.
- Ebobisse, C.: *Die Morphologie des Verbs im Ost-Dangaleat (Guera, Tschad)*. Berlin, 1979., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Ebobisse, C.: *Les verbaux du dangaléat de l'est (Guera, Tchad). Lexiques français-dangaléat et allemand-dangaléat*. Berlin, 1987., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- EDE I = Takács, G.: *Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian. Volume One: A Phonological Introduction*. Leiden, 1999., E.J. Brill.
- EDE II = Takács, G.: *Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian. Volume Two: b-, p-, f-*. Leiden, 2001., E.J. Brill.
- EDE III = Takács, G.: *Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian. Volume Three: m-, n-, l-*. Leiden, 2008., E.J. Brill.
- EG 1957 = Gardiner, A.H.: *Egyptian Grammar*.³ London, 1957., Oxford University Press.
- Ehret, Ch.: *The Historical Reconstruction of Southern Cushitic Phonology and Vocabulary*. Berlin, 1980., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Ehret, Ch.: *Revising Proto-Kuliak*.= *Afrika und Übersee* 64 (1981), 81-100.
- Ehret, Ch.: *Proto-Cushitic Reconstruction*.= *Sprache und Geschichte in Afrika* 8 (1987).
- Ehret, Ch.; Elderkin, E.D.; Nurse, D.: *Dahalo Lexis and Its Sources*.= *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 18 (1989), 5-49.
- Ehret, Ch.: *The Origin of the Third Consonants in the Semitic Roots. An Internal Reconstruction Applied to Arabic*.= *Journal of Afroasiatic Languages* 2/2 (1989), 107-202.

- Ehret, Ch.: *Reconstructing Proto-Afroasiatic (Proto-Afrasian). Vowels, Tone, Consonants, and Vocabulary.* Berkeley, Los Angeles, California, 1995., University of California.
- Ehret, Ch.: (Additions to the Afroasiatic reconstructions.) MS. Los Angeles, California, 1997. 522 p.
- Ehret, Ch.: *A Historical-Comparative Reconstruction of Nilo-Saharan.* Köln, 2001., Köppe.
- Eilers, W.: *Die zweiradikalige Basis der semitischen Wurzel.*= Jungraithmayr, H.; Müller, W.W. (eds.): *Proceedings of the Fourth International Hamito-Semitic Congress.* Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 1987., John Benjamins. Pp. 509-524.
- Elderkin, E. D.: *Dahalo Wordlist (Damman's Sanye).* MS. Nairobi, April 1973. 9 p.
- El-Sayed, R.: *Mots et expressions évoquant l'idée de lumière.*= *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte* 71 (1987), 61-86.
- Ember, A.: *Semito-Egyptian Sound Changes.*= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 49 (1911), 87-92.
- Ember, A.: *Kindred Semito-Egyptian Words.*= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 49 (1911), 93-94.
- Ember, A.: *Notes on the Relation of Egyptian and Semitic.*= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 50 (1912), 86-90.
- Ember, A.: *Kindred Semito-Egyptian Words. New Series.*= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 51 (1913), 110-121.
- Ember, A.: (a) *New Semito-Egyptian Words.* (b) *Some African Words in Old Egyptian.*= *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 37 (1917), 21.
- Ember, A.: *Kindred Semito-Egyptian Words (New Series).* Continued from Vol. 51 pp. 110-121.= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 53 (1917), 83-90.
- Ember, A.: *Egyptian 'idnw „Subordinate, Substitute”.*= *Johns Hopkins University Circulars* 306 (1918), 29-31.
- Ember, A.: (a) *The Phonetic Value of Several of the Egyptian Alphabetic Signs and Their Correspondence Etymologically in the Other Semitic Languages.* (b) *Metathesis in Old Egyptian.*= *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 41 (1921), 177.
- Ember, A.: *Partial Assimilation in Old Egyptian.*= Adler, C. & Ember, A. (eds.): *Oriental Studies Published in Commemoration of the Fortieth Anniversary (1883-1923) of Paul Haupt as the Director of the Oriental Seminary of the Johns Hopkins University.* Baltimore, 1926., The Johns Hopkins University Press. Pp. 300-312.
- Ember, A.: *Egypto-Semitic Studies.* Leipzig, 1930., The Alexander Cohut Memorial Foundation.
- Erman, A.: *Das Verhältnis des Ägyptischen zu den semitischen Sprachen.*= *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 46 (1892), 93-129.
- ESS = Ember, A.: *Egypto-Semitic Studies.* Leipzig, 1930., The Alexander Cohut Memorial Foundation.
- Faber, A.: *Semitic Sibilants in an Afro-Asiatic Context.*= *Journal of Semitic Studies* 29/2 (1984), 189-224.
- Farina, G.: *Le vocali dell'antico egiziano.*= *Aegyptus* 5/4 (1924), 313-325.
- Farina, G.: *Grammatica della lingua egiziana antica in caratteri geroglifici.*² Milano, 1926., U. Hoepli.
- Faulkner, R.O.: *Dw, wdj, rdj.*= *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 45 (1959), 102-3.
- FD = Faulkner, R.O.: *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian.* Oxford, 1962., Clarendon Press.
- Fecht, G.: *Wortakzent und Silbenstruktur. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der ägyptischen Sprache.* Glückstadt, 1960., Verlag J.J. Augustin.
- Fédry, J. (avec la collaboration de Khamis, J. & o/Nedjei, M.): *Dictionnaire dangaleat (Tchad). Thèse de 3^{ème} cycle,* Institut National des Langues et Civilisations Orientales. Lyon, 1971., Afrique et Langage.
- Fitzpatrick, J.F.J.: *Some Notes on the Kwolla District and Its Tribes.*= *Journal of the Royal African Society* 10 (1910-11), 16-52, 213-22.
- Fleming, H.C.: *Asa and Aramanik: Cushitic Hunters in Masai-Land.*= *Ethnology* 8/1 (1969), 1-36.
- Fleming, H.C.: *The Classification of West Cushitic Within Hamito-Semitic.*= McCall, D.F. & Bennett, N.R. & Butler, J. (eds.): *Eastern African History.* New York, 1969., Praeger. Pp. 3-27.
- Fleming, H.C.: *Omoti as an Afroasiatic Family.*= *Studies in African Linguistics. Supplement* 5 (1974), 81-94.
- Fleming, H.C.: *Omoti Overview.*= Bender, M.L. (ed.): *The Non-Semitic Languages of Ethiopia.* East Lansing, 1976., Michigan State University. Pp. 299-323.

- Fleming, H.C.: Kuliak External Relations: Step One.= Vossen, R. & Becchaus-Gerst, M. (ed.): Nilotic Studies. Proceedings of the International Symposium on Languages and History of the Nilotic Peoples, Cologne, January 4-6, 1982. Berlin, 1983., Dietrich Reimer Verlag. Pp. 423-478.
- Fleming, H.C.: Proto-Gongan Consonant Phonemes: Stage One.= Mukarovsky, H.G. (ed.): Leo Reinisch. Werk und Erbe. Wien, 1987., Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Pp. 141-159.
- Fleming, H.C.: Omotica, Afrasiana and More: Ethiopia as the Ever-Flowing Vase.= Mother Tongue 12 (1990), 22-30.
- Foucauld, Ch. de: Dictionnaire touareg-français, dialecte de l'Ahaggar. Vol. I-IV. Paris, 1951-52., Imprimerie Nationale de France.
- Foulkes, H.D.: Angass Manual. Grammar, Vocabulary. London, 1915., Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co.
- Frajzyngier, Z.: A Pero-English and English-Pero Vocabulary. Berlin, 1985., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Frajzyngier, Z.: A Dictionary of Mupun. Berlin, 1991., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Fronzaroli, P.: Studi sul lessico comune semitico. II. Anatomia e fisiologia.= Rendiconti delle Sedute dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche. Ser. VIII, vol. XIX, fasc. 7-12 (1964), 243-280.
- Fronzaroli, P.: Studi sul lessico comune semitico. IV. La religione.= Rendiconti delle Sedute dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche. Ser. VIII, vol. XX, fasc. 5-6 (1965), 246-269.
- Fronzaroli, P.: Studi sul lessico comune semitico. VII. L'alimentazione.= Rendiconti delle Sedute dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche. Ser. VIII, vol. XXVI, fasc. 7-12 (1971), 603-642.
- Gazov-Ginzberg, A.M.: Simvolizm prasemitskoj fleksii. O bezuslovnoj motivirovannosti znaka. Moskva, 1974., Nauka.
- GÄSW = Calice, F. von: Grundlagen der ägyptisch-semitischen Wortvergleichung. Wien, 1936., Selbstverlag des Orientalischen Institutes der Universität Wien.
- GB = Gesenius, W. (bearbeitet von Buhl, F.): Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament. Unveränderter Neudruck der 1915 erschienenen 17. Auflage. Berlin, Göttingen, Heidelberg, 1962., Springer-Verlag.
- GHWb = Hannig, R.: Grosses Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch-Deutsch (2800-950 v. Chr.). Mainz, 1995., Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- Gilula, M.: 'Idn = „an Ear“.= Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 61 (1975), 251.
- Gochal, G.: A Look at Shik Ngas. Jos, 1994., Jos University Press.
- Gordon, C. H.: Egypto-Semita.= Rivista degli Studi Orientali 32 (1957), 269-278.
- Gouffé, C.: Notes de lexicologie et d'étymologie soudanaises.= Comptes Rendus de Group Linguistique d'Études Chamito-Sémitiques 16 (1971-2), 101-119, 155-173.
- Gouffé, C.: Contacts de vocabulaire entre le haoussa et le touareg.= Cohen, D. (ed.): Actes du Premier Congrès International de Linguistique Sémitique et Chamito-Sémitique, Paris, 16-19 juillet 1969. Paris, 1974., Mouton. Pp. 357-380.
- Gragg, G.: Oromo Dictionary. East Lansing, Michigan, 1982., Michigan State University.
- Grandet, P.: Le papyrus Harris I. Glossaire. Le Caire, 1999., IFAO.
- Grapow, H.: Über die Wortbildungen mit einem Präfix m- im Ägyptischen.= Abhandlungen der Kgl. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (1914), 3-33.
- Grapow, H.: Anatomie und Physiologie (Grundriß der Medizin der Alten Ägypter I.). Berlin, 1954., Akademi-Verlag.
- Greenberg, J.H.: The Languages of Africa.= International Journal of American Linguistics 29 (1963).
- Griffith, F.L.: A Collection of Hieroglyphs. A Collection of Hieroglyphs. A Contribution to the History of Egyptian Writing. London, 1898., Egypt Exploration Fund, Kegan Paul & Trench & Trübner & Co.
- Guglielmi, W.: Die Göttin Mr.t: Entstehung und Verehrung einer Personifikation. Leiden, 1991., E.J. Brill.
- Guillaume, A.: Hebrew and Arabic Lexicography. A Comparative Study. Reprinted from: Abd-Nahraim. Vol. I-IV (1959-65). Leiden, 1965., Brill.

- Guthrie, M.: *Comparative Bantu. An Introduction to the Comparative Linguistics and Prehistory of the Bantu Languages. Part I. Vol. 2. Bantu Prehistory, Inventory and Indexes.* Westmead, Farnborough, Hants, 1971., Gregg International Publishers.
- Haberland, E.; Lamberti, M.: *Ibaaddo ka-Ba'iso. Culture and Language of the Ba'iso.* Heidelberg, 1988., Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- HAM = Westendorf, W.: *Handbuch der altägyptischen Medizin.* Leiden, 1999., Brill.
- HCVA I = Diakonoff, I.M.; Belova, A.G.; Militarev, A.Ju.; Porhomovskij, V.Ja.; Stolbova, O.V.: *Historical Comparative Vocabulary of Afroasian. Part 1.= St. Petersburg Journal of African Studies* 2 (1993), 5-28.
- Helck, W.: mr = jmj-r3? = *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 79 (1954), 76-77.
- Hellwig, B.: *Goemai – English – Hausa Dictionary.* MS. Draft. Printed out on 20 August 2000. 42 p.
- Hetzron, R.: *The Nominal System of Awngi (Southern Agaw).* = *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 41 (1978), 121-141.
- Hintze, F.: *Zur hamitosemitischen Wortvergleichung.* = *Zeitschrift für Phonetik und Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft* 5 (1951), 65-87.
- Hintze, F.: *Zur hamitosemitischen Wortvergleichung.* = *Zeitschrift für Phonetik und Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft* 5 (1951), 65-87.
- Hodge, C.T.: *Hausa-Egyptian Establishment.* = *Anthropological Linguistics* 8/1 (1966), 40-57.
- Hodge, C.T.: *Some Afroasiatic Etymologies.* = *Anthropological Linguistics* 10/3 (1968), 19-29.
- Hodge, C.T.: *Egyptian ġ Amid Afroasiatic Languages.* = Sinor, D. (ed.): *American Oriental Society, Middle West Branch, Semi-Centennial Volume. Asian Studies Research Institute, Oriental Series #3.* Bloomington, 1969., Indiana University Press. Pp. 104-110.
- Hodge, C.T.: *An Egypto-Semitic Comparison.* = *Folia Orientalia* 17 (1976), 5-28.
- Hodge, C.T.: *Review of Callender, J.B.: Middle Egyptian.* = *Language* 53/4 (1977), 930-940.
- Hodge, C.T.: *Lislakh IV: Hindo-Hittite Haich.* = *The Fifth LACUS Forum* 1978. Columbia, 1979., Hornbeam Press. Pp. 497-502.
- Hodge, C.T.: *Indo-Europeans in the Near East.* = *Anthropological Linguistics* 23/6 (1981), 227-244.
- Hodge, C.T.: *Lislakh Labials.* = *Anthropological Linguistics* 23/8 (1981), 368-382.
- Hodge, C.T.: *Comparative Evidence for Egyptian Historical Phonology.* = Young, D.W. (ed.): *Studies Presented to Hans Yakob Polotsky.* East Gloucester, 1981., Pirtle and Polson. Pp. 401-413.
- Hodge, C.T.: *Splitting Homonyms.* = Jordan, M.P. (ed.): *The Sixteenth LACUS Forum* 1989. Lake Bluff, 1990., LACUS. Pp. 168-176.
- Hodge, C.T.: *The Multivalence of Hittite ḫ.* = *The Seventeenth LACUS Forum* 1990. Lake Bluff, 1990., LACUS. Pp. 368-374.
- Hodge, C.T.: *The Role of Egyptian within Afroasiatic.* = Baldi, Ph. (ed.): *Linguistic Change and Reconstruction Methodology.* Berlin, New York, 1990., Mouton de Gruyter. Pp. 639-659.
- Hodge, C.T.: *Tooth and Claw.* = *Anthropological Linguistics* 34 (1992), 202-232.
- Hoffmann, C.: *Towards a Comparative Phonology of the Languages of the Angas-Goemai Group.* MS. University of Ibadan, faculty seminar on 19 March 1975. 32 p.
- Holma, H.: *Die Namen der Körperteile im Assyrisch-Babylonischen. Eine lexikalisch-etymologische Studie.* = *Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemia Toimituksia. Sarja B. Nid. 7. No. 1* (1911), 1-183.
- Holma, H.: *Zur semitisch-hamitischen Sprachwissenschaft.* = *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 32 (1919), 34-47.
- Homburger, L.: *Notes sur quelques morphèmes communs à l'égyptien et aux langues négro-africaines.* = *Journal Asiatique* 212 (1928), 323-345.
- Homburger, L.: *Les langues africaines modernes et l'égyptien ancien.* = *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 23/3 (1929), 149-174.
- Hommel, F.: *Die semitischen Völkern und Sprachen.* Leipzig, 1883., Otto Schulze.
- Hommel, F.: *The Ideogram ...* = *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* 15 (1893), 111-112.
- Hommel, F.: *Über den Grad der Verwandtschaft des Altägyptischen mit dem Semitischen.* = *Beiträge zur Assyriologie* 2 (1894), 342-358.

- Hommel, F.: *Grundriss der Geographie und Geschichte des Alten Orients*. München, 1904., C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- HSED = Orel, V.É. & Stolbova, O.V.: *Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary*. Leiden, 1995., E.J. Brill.
- Hudson, G.: *Highland East Cushitic Dictionary*. Hamburg, 1989., Buske.
- IEW = Pokorny, J.: *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Band I. Bern-München, 1959., Francke Verlag.
- IL = Institute of Linguistics. *Bauch Area Survey Report presented by N. Campbell and J. Hoskison*. MS. Zaria, 1972.
- Illič-Svityč, V.M.: *Iz istorii čadskogo konsonantizma. Labial'nye smyčnye*. = Uspenskij, B. A. (ed.): *Jazyki Afriki. Voprosy struktury, istorii i tipologii*. Moskva, 1966., Nauka. Pp. 9-34.
- Illič-Svityč, V.M.: *Opyt sravnenija nostratičeskich jazykov (semitohamitskij, kartvel'skij, indoevropskij, ural'skij, dravidijskij, altajskij)*. *Vvedenie. Sravnitel'nyj slovar' (b-Ķ)*. Moskva, 1971., Nauka.
- Illič-Svityč, V.M.: *Opyt sravnenija nostratičeskich jazykov (semitohamitskij, kartvel'skij, indoevropskij, ural'skij, dravidijskij, altajskij)*. *Sravnitel'nyj slovar' (l-ž)*. Ukazateli. Moskva, 1976., Nauka.
- Jaggar, Ph.J.: *Guruntum (gùrdùn) (West Chadic-B): Linguistic Notes and Wordlist*. = *African Languages and Cultures* 2/2 (1989), 175-202.
- Jahn, A.: *Ägyptologische Miscellen*. = *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 20 (1906), 373-380.
- Jastrow, M.: *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*. Volume I: ?-k, Volume II: l-t. New York, 1950., Pardes Publishing House Inc.
- JEA = *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* (London).
- Jéquier, G.: *Essai sur la nomenclature des parties de bateaux*. = *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 9 (1911), 37-82.
- Johnstone, T.M.: *Jibbāli Lexicon*. London, 1981., Oxford University Press.
- Johnstone, T.M.: *Mehri Lexicon*. London, 1987., University of London.
- Jungraithmayr, H.: *Beobachtungen zur tschadohamitischen Sprache der Jegu (und Jonkor) von Abu Telfan (Republique du Tchad)*. = *Afrika und Übersee* 45 (1961), 95-123.
- Jungraithmayr, H.: *Wörterbuch der Angas-Sprache*. MS. 1962.
- Jungraithmayr, H.: *Die Sprache des Sura (Maghavul) in Nordnigerien*. = *Afrika und Übersee* 47 (1963), 8-89, 204-220.
- Jungraithmayr, H.: *Materialen zur Kenntnis des Chip, Montol, Gerka und Burrum (Südplateau, Nordnigerien)*. = *Afrika und Übersee* 48 (1965), 161-183.
- Jungraithmayr, H.: *Die Ron-Sprachen. Tschadohamitische Studien in Nordnigerien*. Glückstadt, 1970., Verlag J.J. Augustin.
- Jungraithmayr, H.: *Kofa Wordlist*. MS. 1977. 18 p.
- Jungraithmayr, H.; Shimizu, K.: *Chadic Lexical Roots. Vol. II. Tentative Reconstruction, Grading and Distribution*. Berlin, 1981., Verlag von Dietrich Reimer.
- Jungraithmayr, H.: *Chadic within Hamitosemitic or between Hamitosemitic and Nigrific?* = Jungraithmayr, H. (ed.): *The Chad Languages in the Hamitosemitic-Nigrific Border Area*. Berlin, 1982., Dietrich Reimer Verlag. Pp. 3-8.
- Jungraithmayr, H.: *Peut-on parler de traits non chamito-sémitiques dans les langues tchadiques?* = Jungraithmayr, H. (éd.): *Langues tchadiques et langues non tchadiques en contact en Afrique Centrale*. Paris, 1987., SELAF. Pp. 19-26.
- Jungraithmayr, H.: *Lexique mokilko*. Berlin, 1990., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Jungraithmayr, H.: *Lexique mubi-français (Tchad oriental)*. MS. Frankfurt a/M, 1990. 50 p.
- Jungraithmayr, H. (in collaboration with N.A. Galadima and U. Kleinewillinghöfer): *A Dictionary of the Tangale Language (Kaltungo, Northern Nigeria) with a Grammatical Introduction*. Berlin, 1991., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.

- Jungraithmayr, H. & Ibrizimow, D.: Chadic Lexical Roots. Volume I. Tentative Reconstruction, Grading, Distribution and Comments. Berlin, 1994., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Jungraithmayr, H. & Ibrizimow, D.: Chadic Lexical Roots. Volume II. Documentation. Berlin, 1994., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Jungraithmayr, H.: Was ist am Tschadischen hamitosemitisch? = *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 7/2 (1994), 225-233.
- Jungraithmayr, H.: Das Birgit, eine osttschadische Sprache – Vokabular und grammatische Notizen. = Takács, G. (ed.): *Egyptian and Semito-Hamitic (Afro-Asiatic) Studies in Memoriam Werner Vycichl*. Leiden, 2004., E.J. Brill. Pp. 342-371.
- Jušmanov, N. V.: *Stroj jazyka hausa*. Leningrad, 1937., Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo Naučno-Issledovatel'skogo Instituta Jazykoznanija.
- Jušmanov, N.V. (edited by Belova, A.G.): *Izbrannye trudy. Raboty po obščej fonetike, semitologii i arabskoj klassičeskoj morfologii*. Moskva, 1998., Izdatel'skaja firma „Vostočnaja literatura” RAN.
- Kaplony, P.: Strukturprobleme der Hieroglyphenschrift. = *CdE* 41 (1966), 60-99.
- KB = Koehler, L. & Baumgartner, W.: *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. I-V. Leiden, 1994-2000, E. J. Brill.
- KBIÄF = Kaplony, P.: *Kleine Beiträge zu den Inschriften der ägyptischen Frühzeit*. Wiesbaden, 1966., Harrassowitz.
- KHW = Westendorf, W.: *Koptisches Handwörterbuch*. Heidelberg, 1977., Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Kießling, R. & Mous, M.: *The Lexical Reconstruction of West-Rift Southern Cushitic*. Kuschitische Sprachstudien, Band 21. Köln, 2004., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Kluge, F.: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. 23., erweiterte Auflage (Jubiläums-Sonderausg.). Bearbeitet von Elmar Seebold. Berlin & New York, 1999., Walter de Gruyter.
- Knauf, E.A.: Zur Etymologie der Handhieroglyphe. = *Göttinger Miszellen* 59 (1982), 29-39.
- Kogan, L.E.: O nereguljarnyh refleksah protosemitikh laringalov v akkadskom jazyke. = *Vestnik Drevnej Istorii* 2 (1995), 156-162.
- Kraft, Ch.H.: *Chadic Wordlists*. I-III. Berlin, 1981., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- KRI = Kitchen, K.A.: *Ramesside Inscriptions - Historical and Biographical*. Vol. I-VII. Oxford, 1968/1975-83/89., Oxford University Press.
- Kurth, D. (ed.): *Studien zu Vokabular, Ikonographie und Grammatik*. Wiesbaden, 1994., Harrassowitz.
- Lacau, P.: *Sur le système hiéroglyphique*. Le Caire, 1954., IFAO.
- Lacau, P.: *Égyptien et sémitique*. = *Syria* 31 (1954), 286-306.
- Lacau, P.: *Les noms des parties du corps en égyptien et en sémitique*. Paris, 1970., Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- Lacau, P.: *Études d'Égyptologie*. I. Phonétique égyptienne ancienne. Le Caire, 1970., IFAO.
- Lacau, P.: *Études d'Égyptologie*. II. Morphologie. Le Caire, 1972., IFAO.
- Lam, A.M.: *De l'origine égyptienne des Peuls*. Paris & Gif-sur-Yvette, 1993., Présence Africaine & Khepera.
- Lambdin, Th. O.: *Egyptian Loan Words in the Old Testament*. = *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 73 (1953), 145-155.
- Lamberti, M.: Some Konsoid Etymologies. = *Anthropos* 82/4-6 (1987), 529-541.
- Lamberti, M.: *Die Shinassha-Sprache*. Materialien zum Boro. Heidelberg, 1993., Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Lamberti, M.: *Materialien zum Yemsa*. Heidelberg, 1993., Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Lane, E.W.: *An Arabic-English Lexicon*. I-VIII. London & Edinburgh, 1863-93., Williams and Norgate.
- Lanfray, J.: *Ghadames*. II. Glossaire. Alger, 1973., Le Fichier Periodique.
- LÄ = Helck, W. & Westendorf, W. (Hrsg., begründet von W. Helck und E. Otto): *Lexikon der Ägyptologie*. Band I-VII. Wiesbaden, 1975-92., Harrassowitz.
- Lefébvre, G.: *Tableau des parties du corps humain mentionnées par les égyptiens*. Le Caire, 1952., Imprimerie de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale.
- Lesko, L.H.: *The Ancient Egyptian Book of Two Ways*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1972., University of California Press.

- Leslau, W.: *Lexique soqotri* (sudarabique moderne), avec comparaisons et explications étymologiques. Paris, 1938., Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- Leslau, W.: *Gafat Documents. Records of a South-Ethiopic Language. Grammar, Text and Comparative Vocabulary*. New Haven, Connecticut, 1945., American Oriental Society.
- Leslau, W.: The Parts of the Body in Modern South Arabic Languages.= *Language* 21 (1945), 230-249.
- Leslau, W.: Examen du supposé argobba de Seetzen et de Lefebvre.= *Word* 5 (1949), 46-54.
- Leslau, W.: Review of Cohen, M.: *Essai comparatif etc.*= *Language* 25 (1949), 312-316.
- Leslau, W.: *Étude descriptive et comparative du gafat* (éthiopien méridional). Paris, 1956., Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- Leslau, W.: *A Dictionary of Moča* (Southwestern Ethiopia). Berkeley, Los Angeles, 1959., University of California Press.
- Leslau, W.: A Prefix *h* in Egyptian, Modern South Arabian, and Hausa.= *Africa* 32 (1962), 65-68.
- Leslau, W.: *Etymological Dictionary of Harari*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, 1963., University of California.
- Leslau, W.: *Hebrew Cognates in Amharic*. Wiesbaden, 1969., Otto Harrassowitz.
- Leslau, W.: *Southeast Semitic Cognates to the Akkadian Vocabulary. III.*= *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 89 (1969), 18-22.
- Leslau, W.: *Etymological Dictionary of Gurage* (Ethiopic). Vol. III. Etymological Section. Wiesbaden, 1979., Otto Harrassowitz.
- Leslau, W.: *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez* (Classical Ethiopic). Wiesbaden, 1987., Otto Harrassowitz.
- Leslau, W.: Observations on Sasse's Vocabulary of Burji.= *Afrika und Übersee* 71 (1988), 177-203.
- Levy, J.: *Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim nebst Beiträgen von Heinrich Leberecht Fleischer. Zweite Auflage mit Nachträgen und Berichtigungen von Lazarus Goldschmidt. I-IV*. Berlin & Wien, 1924., Benjamin Harz Verlag.
- Lexa, F.: Comment se révèlent les rapports entre les langues hamitiques, sémitiques et la langue égyptienne dans la grammaire des pronoms personnels, des verbes et dans les numéraux cardinaux 1-9.= *Philologica* 1 (1922), 151-177.
- Lipiński, E.: *Semitic Languages. Outline of a Comparative Grammar*. Leuven, 1997., Uitgeverij Peeters en Departement Oosterse Studies.
- Louali-Raynal, N.: Les mutations de *l* et du *r* pan-berbères.= Naït-Zerrad, K. (éd.): *Articles de linguistique berbère. Mémoial Werner Vycichl*. Pp. 301-334.
- Lukas, J.: *Die Logone-Sprache im Zentralen Sudan.*= *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 21/6 (1936).
- Lukas, J.: *Zentralsudanische Studien.*= *Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiet der Auslandskunde*. Hansische Universität, Reihe B, Band 45/24 (1937).
- Lukas, J.: *Studien zur Sprache der Gisiga* (Nordkamerun). Hamburg, 1970., Verlag J.J. Augustin.
- Lukas, J.: Über das erweiterte Verb im Bolanci (Nordnigerien).= *Journal of African Languages* 10/1 (1971), 1-14.
- Lukas, J.: Die Personalia und das primäre Verb im Bolanci (Nordnigerien). Mit Beiträge über das Karekare.= *Afrika und Übersee* 55 (1971), 114-139.
- Lukas, J.: Tschadische Studien I. Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Mokulu.= *Afrika und Übersee* 60 (1977), 1-58, 182-229.
- Lukas, R.: Das Nomen im Bade (Nordnigerien).= *Afrika und Übersee* 51 (1968), 91-116, 198-224.
- Magwa, J.G. et al. (20 members of the „Ron Language Committee“): *A Ron Alphabet*. Jos, Nigeria, 1985., Nigeria Bible Translation Trust.
- Majzel', S.S. (additions by and edited by Militarev, A. Ju.): *Puti razvitija kornevogo fonda semitskih jazykov*. Moskva, 1983., Nauka.
- Massart, A.: À propos des „listes“ dans les textes égyptiens funéraires et magiques.= *Studia Biblica et Orientalia*. Vol. III. Roma, 1959., Pontificio Istituto Biblico. Pp. 227-246.
- Matsushita, Sh.: *An Outline of Gwandara Phonemics and Gwandara-English Vocabulary*. Tokyo, 1972., Tokyo Press.

- Meeks, D.: Mots sans suite ou notations rituelles? (O.DeM 1696 et O.Petrie 36).= Demarée, R.J. & Egberts, A. (eds.): *Deir el-Medina in the Third Millennium AD. A Tribute to Jac J. Janssen*. Leiden, 2000., Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten (NINO). Pp. 235-249.
- Meeks, D.: Review of Hannig, R.: *Ägyptisches Wörterbuch I. Altes Reich und Erste Zwischenzeit*.= *Lingua Aegyptia* 13 (2005), 231-263.
- Meinhof, C.: *Die Sprachen den Hamiten*. Hamburg, 1912., Friedrichsen & Co.
- Militarev, A.Ju.: Afrazijsko-indoevropskie leksičeskie svjazi.= *Irano-afrazijskie jazykovye kontakty*. Moskva, 1987., Nauka. Pp. 98-108.
- Militarev, A.Ju.; Stolbova, O.V.: First Approach to Comparative-Historical Phonology of Afrasian (Consonantism).= Mukarovsky, H. G. (ed.): *Proceedings of the Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress. Band I*. Wien, 1990., Afro-Pub. Pp. 45-72.
- Militarev, A.Ju.: Istoričeskaja fonetika i leksika livijsko-guančskih jazykov.= Solncev, V.M. (ed.): *Jazyki Azii i Afriki. IV, kniga 2*. Moskva, 1991., Glavnaja Redakcija Vostočnoj Literatury. Pp. 238-267.
- Militarev, A.Ju.: Root Extension and Root Formation in Semitic and Afrasian.= *Aula Orientalis* 23 (2005), 83-129.
- Militarev, A.Ju.: Once More About Glottochronology and the Comparative Method: the Omotic-Afrasian Case.= *Orientalia et Classica. Trudy Instituta vostočnyh kul'tur i antičnosti*. Vypusk VI. Moskva, 2005., Rossijskij Gosudarstvennyj Gumanitarnyj Universitet. Pp. 339-408.
- Motylnski, A. de C.: *Le dialecte berbère de R'edamès*. Paris, 1904., Ernest Leroux.
- Mouchet, J.: *Vocabulaires comparatifs de quinze parlers du Nord-Cameroun*.= *Bulletin de la Société d'Études Camerounaises* 29-30 (1950), 5-74.
- Mouchet, J.: *Le parler daba: esquisse grammaticale précédée d'une note sur l'ethnie daba, suivie de lexiques daba-français et français-daba*. Yaoundé, 1966., R.E.C.
- Möller, G.: *Aegyptisch-libysches*.= *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 24/9-10 (1921), 193-197.
- Möller, G.: *Die Ägypter und ihre libyschen Nachbarn*.= *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 78 (1924), 36-60.
- Mukarovsky, H.G.: *West African and Hamito-Semitic Languages*.= *Wiener Völkerkundliche Mitteilungen* 13 (1966), 9-36.
- Mukarovsky, H.G.: *Wo steht das Saharische?*= *Afrika und Übersee* 64 (1981), 187-226.
- Mukarovsky, H.G.: *Mande-Chadic Common Stock. A Study of Phonological and Lexical Evidence*. Wien, 1987., Afro-Pub.
- Mukarovsky, H.G.: *On the Relations of Cushitic, Omotic and Chadic Languages*. MS. Handout for the 2nd International Symposium on Cushitic and Omotic Languages, Torino, 1989. 6 p. Proceedings not published.
- Mukarovsky, H.G.: *Die Weltrichtungen im Ägyptischen, im Hausa und in einigen weiteren Sprachen Afrikas*.= *Zwischen den beiden Ewigkeiten. Festschrift Gertrud Thausing*. Wien, 1994., Eigenverlag des Institutes für Ägyptologie der Universität Wien. Pp. 146-153.
- Mukarovsky, H.G.: *Chadic, Mande and Nigritic*.= Ibrizimow, D.; Leger, R. (eds.): *Studia Chadica et Hamitosemitica*. Köln, 1995., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag. Pp. 65-75.
- Müller, W.M.: *Altafrikanische Glossen*.= *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 10 (1896), 203-211.
- Müller, W.M.: *The False r in Archaic Egyptian Orthography*.= *Recueil de Travaux Relatifs à la Philologie et à l'Archéologie Égyptiennes et Assyriennes* 31 (NS 15) (1909), 182-201.
- Müller, W.W.: Review of Diakonoff, I.M.: *Semito-Hamitic Languages*.= *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 7-8 (1968), 363-366.
- Müller, W.W.: *Beiträge zur hamito-semitischen Wortvergleichung*.= Bynon, J. & Bynon, Th. (eds.): *Hamito-Semitic*. The Hague, 1975., Mouton de Gruyter. Pp. 63-74.
- NBÄ = Osing, J.: *Die Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen. I-II*. Maiz/Rhein, 1976., Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- Netting, R.M.: *Kofyar Vocabulary*. MS. 1967.
- Newman, P.: *A Word List of Tera*.= *Journal of West African Languages* 1/2 (1964), 33-50.

- Newman, P.; Ma, R.: Comparative Chadic: Phonology and Lexicon.= *Journal of African Languages* 5/3 (1966), 218-251.
- Newman, P.: Chadic Classification and Reconstructions.= *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 5/1 (1977), 1-42.
- Nicolas, F.: Vocabulaires ethnographiques de la Tamâjeq des Iullemmeden de l'est (Touâreg de la Colonie du Niger, Afrique Occidentale Française).= *Anthropos* 52 (1957), 49-63, 564-580.
- Ol'derogge, D.A.: Proishozhdenie narodov Central'nogo Sudana (iz drevnejšej istorii jazykov gruppy hausa-kotoko).= *Sovetskaja Étnografija* 2 (1952), 23-38.
- Ol'derogge, D.A.: Jazyk hausa. Kratkij očerk grammatiki, hrestomatija i slovar'. Leningrad, 1954., Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo Universiteta.
- Ol'derogge, D.A.: Proishozhdenie jazyka hausa. The Origin of the Hausa Language.= *Doklady soverskoj delegacii na V Meždunarodnom Kongresse Antropologov i Étnografov. Papers Presented by the Soviet Delegation at the V International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences. Moskva, 1956., Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR. Pp. 3-28.*
- Ol'derogge, D.A.: The Origin of the Hausa language.= Wallace, A. F. C. (ed.): *Men and Cultures. Philadelphia, 1960., University of Pennsylvania Press. Pp. 795-802.*
- Orel, V.É. & Stolbova, O.V.: K rekonstrukcii praafrazijskogo vokalizma. 3-4.= *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 2 (1990), 75-90.
- Orel, V.É. & Stolbova, O.V.: Cushitic, Chadic, and Egyptian: Lexical Relations.= Shevoroshkin, V. (ed.): *Nostratic, Dene-Caucasian, Austric and Amerind. Bochum, 1992., Brockmeyer. Pp. 167-180.*
- Orel, V.É. & Stolbova, O.V.: On Chadic-Egyptian Lexical Relations.= Shevoroshkin, V. (ed.): *Nostratic, Dene-Caucasian, Austric and Amerind. Bochum, 1992., Brockmeyer. Pp. 181-203.*
- Orel, V.É.: Semitohamitskij, sinokavkazskij, nostratičeskij.= *Moskovskij Lingvističeskij Žurnal* 1 (1995), 99-116.
- Orel, V.É.: Semitohamitskij i nostratičeskij: dopolnenija k nostratičeskim étimologijam i novye sopostavlenija.= *Moskovskij Lingvističeskij Žurnal* 1 (1995), 117-128.
- Ormsby, G.: Notes on the Angass Language.= *Journal of the Royal African Society* 12 (1912-1913), 421-424 & 13 (1913-1914), 54-61, 204-210, 313-315.
- Osing, J.: Sprüche gegen die jbh3tj-Schlange.= *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 43 (1986), 205-210.
- Parker, E.M. & Hayward, R.J.: *An Afar-English-French Dictionary (with Grammatical Notes in English).* London, 1985., School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.
- Piamenta, M.: *Dictionary of Post-Classical Yemeni Arabic. I-II. Leiden, 1990-91., Brill.*
- Pillinger, S. & Galboran, L.: *A Rendille Dictionary. Köln, 1999., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.*
- Pilszczikowa, N.: Contribution à l'étude des rapports entre le haoussa et les autres langues du groupe nigéro-tchadien.= *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 22/2 (1958), 75-99.
- Pilszczikowa, N.: Le haoussa et le chamito-sémitique à la lumière de l'Essai comparatif de Marcel Cohen.= *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 24/1 (1960), 97-130.
- PL = Wilson, P.: *A Ptolemaic Lexikon. A Lexicographical Study of the Texts in the Temple of Edfu. Leuven, 1997., Peeters.*
- Porhomovskij, V.Ja.: *Istoričeskij konsonantizm jazykov kotoko. Moskva, 1972., Institut Jazykoznanija Akademii Nauk SSSR.*
- Prasse, K.-G.: A propos de l'origine de h touareg (tahaggart).= *Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser* 43/3 (1969).
- Prasse, K.-G.; Alojaly, Gh.; Mohamed, Gh.: *Lexique touareg-français. Copenhagen, 1998., Museum Tusculanum Press, Université de Copenhagen.*
- Prasse, K.-G.; Alojaly, Gh.; Mohamed, Gh.: *Dictionnaire touareg-français (Niger). Copenhagen, 2003., Museum Tusculanum Press, University of Copenhagen.*
- Provotelle, (?): *Étude sur la tamazir't ou zénatia de Qalaât es-Sened (Tunisie). Paris, 1911., Ernest Leroux.*
- PT = Sethe, K.: *Die altägyptischen Pyramidentexte. I-II. Leipzig, 1908., 1910., J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.*

- Rabin, Ch.: Lexicostatistics and the Internal Divisions of Semitic.= Bynon, J.; Bynon, Th. (eds.): *Hamito-Semitic*. The Hague, 1975., Mouton. Pp. 85-102.
- Rabin, Ch.: *Hamitic Languages as a Source of Semitic Languages*.= *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (held at The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 13-19 August 1973 under the auspices of The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities). Volume I. Jerusalem, 1977., World Union of Jewish Studies. Pp. 329-340.
- Rabin, Ch.: *Ron-Semitic Etymologies*.= Jungraithmayr, H. (ed.): *The Chad Languages in the Hamitosemitic-Nigritic Border Area*. Berlin, 1982., Dietrich Reimer Verlag. Pp. 24-31.
- Rapp, E.L. & Benzing, B.: *Dictionary of the Glavdá Language*. Frankfurt am Main, 1968., Bible Society Frankfurt am Main.
- Reinisch, L.: *Die Sprache Saho-Irob in Abessinien*.= *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Classe* 90/9 (1878), 89-142.
- Reinisch, L.: *Die Chamirsprache in Abessinien. II. Chamir-deutsches Wörterbuch*.= *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil.-hist. Classe* 106 (1884), 330-450.
- Reinisch, L.: *Die Quarasprache in Abessinien. II. Quarisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*.= *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil.-hist. Classe* 109/1 (1885), 3-152.
- Reinisch, L.: *Die ʿAfar-Sprache. II.*= *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil.-hist. Classe* 113/2 (1886), 795-916.
- Reinisch, L.: *Wörterbuch der Bilin-Sprache*. Wien, 1887., Alfred Hoelder.
- Reinisch, L.: *Die ʿAfar-Sprache. III. Deutsch-ʿAfarsches Wörterverzeichnis*.= *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil.-hist. Classe* 114/1 (1887), 89-168.
- Reinisch, L.: *Die Kafa-Sprache in Nordost-Afrika. II. Kafa-Deutsches Wörterbuch*.= *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil.-hist. Classe* 116 (1888), 251-386.
- Reinisch, L.: *Wörterbuch der Saho-Sprache*. Wien, 1890., Alfred Hölder.
- Reinisch, L.: *Die Beḍawye-Sprache in Nordost-Afrika. III.*= *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil.-hist. Classe* 130/7 (1894), 1-80.
- Reinisch, L.: *Wörterbuch der Bedawye-Sprache*. Wien, 1895., Alfred Hölder Verlag.
- Reinisch, L.: *Die Somali-Sprache. II. Wörterbuch*. Wien, 1902., Alfred Hölder Verlag.
- Renisio, A.: *Étude sur les dialectes berbères des Beni Iznassen, du Rif et des Senhaja de Sraïr. Grammaire, textes et lexique*. Paris, 1932., Éditions Ernest Leroux.
- Reutt, T.E. & Kogan, E.Z.: *Materialy po leksike jazykov margi i bura*.= *Bespis'mennye i mladopis'mennye jazyki Afriki*. Moskva, 1973., Nauka. Pp. 83-147.
- Ricks, S.D.: *A Lexicon of Epigraphic Qatabanian*. Ph.D. dissertation. Berkeley, California, 1982., Graduate Theological University, Berkeley, California.
- Roccati, A.: *Ricerca sulla scrittura egizia – III. La notazione vocalica nella scrittura geroglifica*.= *Oriens Antiquus* 27 (1988), 115-126.
- Roper, E.-M.: *Tu Beḍawie. An Elementary Handbook for the Use of Sudan Government Officials*. Hertford, 1928., Stephen Austin & Sons.
- Roquet, G.: *La réécriture: facteur critique de l'étymologie*.= Junge, F. (Hrsg.): *Studien zu Sprache und Religion Ägyptens*. Zu Ehren von Wolfhart Westendorf überreicht von seinen Freunden und Schülern. Göttingen, 1984., Friedrich Junge. Pp. 355-382.
- Rossing, M.O.: *Mafa-Mada: A Comparative Study of Chadic Languages in North Cameroun*. Ph.D. dissertation. Wisconsin, 1978., University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Rössler, O.: *Der semitische Charakter der libyschen Sprache*.= *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 50 (1952), 121-150.
- Rössler, O.: *Libysch-Hamitisch-Semitisch*.= *Oriens* 17 (1964), 199-216.
- Rössler, O.: *Das ältere ägyptische Umschreibungssystem für Fremdnamen und seine sprachwissenschaftliche Lernen*.= Lukas, J. (ed.): *Neue afrikanistische Studien*. Hamburg, 1966., Deutsches Institut für Afrika-Forschung. Pp. 218-229.

- Rössler, O.: Das Ägyptische als semitische Sprache.= Altheim, F. & Stiehl, R. (eds.): Christentum am Roten Meer. Band I. Berlin, New York, 1971., Walter de Gruyter. Pp. 263-325.
- Rössler, O.: Berberisch-tschadisches Kernvokabular.= *Africana Marburgensia* 12/1-2 (1979), 20-31.
- Rössler, O.: Review of Vycichl, W.: Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue copte.= *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 137/2 (1987), 383-385.
- Sachnine, M.: Dictionnaire lamé-français. Lexique français-lamé. Paris, 1982., SELAF.
- Sasse, H.-J.: Notes on the Structure of Galab.= *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 37 (1974), 407-438.
- Sasse, H.-J.: The Consonant Phonemes of Proto-East-Cushitic (PEC).= *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 7/1 (1979), 1-67.
- Sasse, H.-J.: An Etymological Dictionary of Burji. Hamburg, 1982., Helmut Buske Verlag.
- Sasse, H.-J.: Notes on the Prefixation of *ʔa- in Afroasiatic.= Mendel, D.; Claudi, U. (eds.): Ägypten im afro-orientalischen Kontext: Aufsätze zur Archäologie, Geschichte und Sprache eines unbegrenzten Raumes. Gedenkschrift Peter Behrens (Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere, Sondernummer 1991). Köln, 1991., Universität zu Köln. Pp. 271-277.
- Sauneron, S.: Remarques de philologie et d'étymologie (§§19-25).= *Revue d'Égyptologie* 15 (1963), 49-62.
- Schenkel, W.: *mūhn̄t „Fähre“. Die Graphie mw_o des Nominalbildungspräfixes m: in den Sargtexten, Schreiberlaune und Indiz für die Vokalisation.= *Göttinger Miszellen* 168 (1999), 87-100.
- Schneider, Th.: Beiträge zur sogenannten „neueren Komparatistik“. Zum Gedenken an Otto Rössler (1907-1991).= *Lingua Aegyptia* 5 (1997), 189-209.
- Schuh, R.G.: A Dictionary of Ngizim. Berkeley, California, 1981., University of California.
- Schuh, R.G.: West Chadic Vowel Correspondences.= Bynon, J. (ed.): *Current Progress in Afro-Asiatic Linguistics*. Amsterdam, 1984., John Benjamins. Pp. 167-223.
- SED I = Kogan, A. & Militarev, A. (with assistance of A. Belova, A. Kovalev, A. Nemirovskaja, D. Nosnitsyn): *Semitic Etymological Dictionary. Vol. I. Anatomy of Man and Animals*. Münster, 2000., Ugarit-Verlag.
- Sethe, K.: Von Zahlen und Zahlworten bei den alten Ägyptern und was für andere Völker und Sprachen daraus zu lernen ist. Strassburg, 1916., Karl J. Trübner.
- Sethe, K.: Das Zahlwort „fünf“.= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 62 (1927), 60-61.
- Sethe, K.: Zum Namen Pharaithos.= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 63 (1928), 99.
- Sethe, K.: Zu ÄZ 62, 83ff.= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 63 (1928), 99-101.
- Shimizu, K.: The Southern Bauchi Group of Chadic Languages. A Survey Report.= *Africana Marburgensia. Special Issue* 2 (1978), 1-50.
- Siebert, R. & Wedekind, Ch.: Third S.L.L.E. Survey on Languages of the Begi/Asosa Area.= *Survey of Little-Known Languages of Ethiopia (S.L.L.E.) Reports* 15 (1994), 1-19.
- Siebert, R.: A Survey of the Male Language.= *Survey of Little-Known Languages of Ethiopia (S.L.L.E.) Reports* 24 (1994-95), 1-12.
- Sirlinger, E.: Dictionary of the Goemay Language. Jos, Nigeria, 1937., Prefecture Apostolic of Jos.
- SISAJa I = D'jakonov, I.M.; Belova, A.G.; Četveruhin, A.S.; Militarev, A.Ju.; Porhomovskij, V.Ja.; Stolbova, O.V.: *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskij slovar' afrazijskich jazykov. Vypusk 1. p-p-b-f.= Pis'mennye pamjatniki i problemy istorii kul'tury narodov Vostoka. XV godičnaja naučnaja sessija Leningradskogo Otdelenija Instituta Vostokovedenija Akademii Nauk SSSR*. Moskva, 1981., Nauka. Pp. 3-127.
- Skinner, M.G.: Aspects of Pa'anci Grammar. Ph.D. thesis. Madison, 1979., University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- Skinner, N.: North Bauchi Chadic Languages: Common Roots.= *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 4/1 (1977), 1-49.
- Skinner, N.: „Eye“ and „Tongue“ in Afroasiatic.= Jungraithmayr, H.; Müller, W.W. (eds.): *Proceedings of the Fourth International Hamito-Semitic Congress, Marburg, 20-22 September, 1983*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 1987., John Benjamins. Pp. 73-83.
- Skinner, N.: Body Parts in Hausa – Comparative Data.= Ebermann, E. & Sommerauer, E.R. & Thomanek, K.É. (eds.): *Komparative Afrikanistik: Sprach-, geschichts- und literaturwissenschaftliche Aufsätze zu Ehren von Hans G. Mukarovskij anlässlich seines 70. Geburtstags*. Wien, 1992., Afro-Pub. Pp. 345-357.

- Skinner, N.: Evidence for Earlier Nominal Affixation in Afroasian.= Ibrizimow, D. & Leger, R. (Hrsg.): *Studia Chadica et Hamitosemitica*. Köln, 1995., Rüdiger Köppe Verlag. Pp. 25-35.
- Smith, H.S.: *Varia Ptolemaica*.= Ruffle, J.; Gaballa, G.A.; Kitchen, K.A. (eds.): *Glimpses of Ancient Egypt. Studies in Honour of H.W. Fairman*. Warminster, 1979., Aris & Phillips. Pp. 161-166.
- Spiegel, J.: *Das Auferstehungsritual der Unas-Pyramide*. Wiesbaden, 1971., Harrassowitz.
- Spiegelberg, W.: *Koptisches Handwörterbuch*. Heidelberg, 1921., Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Starostin, S.A.; Dybo, V.A.; Dybo, A.V.; Helimsky, E.A.; Militarev, A.Ju.; Mudrak, O.A.; Starostin, G.S.: *Basic Nostratic-Afrasian-Sino-Caucasian Lexical Correspondences*. Preliminary working version. MS. Moscow, 1995.
- Stern, L.: Die XXII. manethonische Dynastie.= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 21 (1883), 15-26.
- Stolbova, O.V.: Soglasnye verhnepzapadnočadskih jazykov. Genetičeskie sootvetstvija.= Makaev, É.A. (ed.): *Istoriko-tipologičeskie i sinhronno-tipologičeskie issledovanija (na materiale jazykov raznyh sistem)*. Moskva, 1972., Institut Jazykoznanija Akademii Nauk SSSR.
- Stolbova, O.V.: Materialy k sravnitel'noj fonetike afrazijskich jazykov (zapadnočadskie rekonstrukcii).= Ivanov, V.V. & Bulatova, R.V. & Dybo, V.A. & Helimskij, E.A. (eds.): *Konferencija „Nostratičeskie jazyki i nostratičeskoe jazykoznanie”*. Tezisy dokladov. Moskva, 1977., Institut Slavjanovedenija i Balkanistiki Akademii Nauk SSSR. Pp. 64-65.
- Stolbova, O.V.: Opyt rekonstrukcii verhnepzapadnočadskih kornej.= *Jazyki zarubežnogo Vostoka. Sbornik statej*. Moskva, 1977., Nauka. Pp. 152-160.
- Stolbova, O.V.: *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskaja fonetika i slovar' zapadnočadskih jazykov*.= Porhomovskij, V.Ja. (ed.): *Afrikanskoe istoričeskoe jazykoznanie. Problemy rekonstrukcii*. Moskva, 1987., Nauka. Pp. 30-268.
- Stolbova, O.V.: Lateral Sibilants in Chadic (Reconstruction) and Their Correspondences in Semitic and Egyptian. MS. Paper presented at the Symposium on Chadic and Hamito-Semitic, Frankfurt am Main, 6-8 May 1991. 9 p.
- Stolbova, O.V.: *Studies in Chadic Comparative Phonology*. Moscow, 1996., "Diaphragma" Publishers.
- Stolbova, O.V.: *Chadic Lexical Database*. Issue I. L, N, NY, R. Kaluga, 2005., Poligrafiya.
- Stroemer, H.: *A Comparative Study of Three Southern Oromo Dialects in Kenya*. Hamburg, 1987., Buske.
- Strümpell, F.: Vergleichendes Wörterverzeichnis der Heidensprachen Adamauas.= *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 42 (1910), 444-488.
- Strümpell, F.: Wörterverzeichnis der Heidensprachen des Mandara-Gebirges (Adamaua).= *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen* 13 (1922-23), 109-149.
- Taïfi, M.: *Dictionnaire tamazight-français (parlers du Maroc central)*. Paris, 1991., L'Harmattan-Awal.
- Takács, G.: Egyptian *d3, *dn, *g3, *gn, and *qd „to be Round”.= *General Linguistics* 34 (1994), 44-54.
- Takács, G.: Egyiptomi *ğ3, *ğn, *g3, *gn.= *Antik Tanulmányok* (1994), 172-175.
- Takács, G.: Egyptian m3t „to Think out”.= *Archív Orientální* 63/2 (1995), 159-161.
- Takács, G.: The Afrasian Origin of Egyptian rm „Fish” (shortened version).= Koval', A.I. & Vinogradov, V.A. (eds.): *Problemy izucenija jazykov Afriki. Materialy konferencii posvjaščennoj 30-letiju Otdela Afrikanских Jazykov Instituta Jazykoznanija Rossijskoj Akademii Nauk (Moskva, 4-6 dekabrja 1995 g.)*. Moskva, 1995., Institut Jazykoznanija RAN. Pp. 159-164.
- Takács, G.: Egyptian Lexis in an Afrasian Perspective: New Etymologies.= *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia* 1 (1996), 125-171.
- Takács, G.: Selected New Egypto-Afrasian Correspondences from the Field of Anatomical Terminology.= Bausi, A. & Tosco, M. (eds.): *Afroasiatica Neapolitana. Papers from the 8th Italian Meeting of Afroasiatic (Hamito-Semitic) Linguistics*, Naples, January 25-26, 1996. Napoli, 1997., Istituto Universitario Orientale. Pp. 225-250.
- Takács, G.: The Common Afrasian Nominal Class Marker *h.= *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia* 2 (1997), 241-273.
- Takács, G.: Refining Some Etymologies around the Root „Round” in Afrasian and Egyptian.= *General Linguistics* 36/3 (1998), 153-166.

- Takács, G.: Development of Afro-Asiatic (Semitic-Hamitic) Comparative-Historical Linguistics in Russia and the Former Soviet Union. München, Newcastle, 1999., Lincom Europa.
- Takács, G.: Comparative Dictionary of the Angas-Sura Languages. Berlin, 2004., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Takács, G.: Aegyptio-Afroasiatica XIX.= *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 57/2 (2004), 47-89.
- Takács, G.: Angas-Sura Etymologies II.= *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 57/1 (2004), 55-68.
- Takács, G.: Egyptian Lexicography and Etymology: Against or With Afro-Asiatic Comparison?= *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 58/2 (2005), 14-113.
- Takács, G.: Otto Rössler's New System of Egypto-Semitic Consonant Correspondences. Part One.= *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 59/2 (2006), 90-127.
- Takács, G.: Semitic Ghayin in an Afro-Asiatic Perspective.= Pennacchietti, F.; Mengozzi, A. (eds.): Proceedings of the 3rd Meeting of the IACS (Torino, Oct. 2008) published in: *Aula Orientalis* (Barcelona) 29 (2011), 139-154.
- Takács, G.: Studies in Afro-Asiatic Comparative Phonology (Consonants). Berlin, 2011., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Thiene, G. da: Dizionario della lingua Galla con brevi nozioni grammaticali. Harar, 1939., Vicariato Apostolico.
- Till, W.C.: Koptische Grammatik. Saïdischer Dialekt. Leipzig, 1955., Otto Harrassowitz.
- Torczyner, H.: Besprechung von Holma, H.: Die Namen der Körperteile im Assyrisch-Babylonischen.= *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 66 (1912), 767-771.
- Tosco, M.: A Grammatical Sketch of Dahalo. Hamburg, 1991., Helmut Buske Verlag.
- Tourneux, H.: Le mulwi ou vulum de Mogroum (Tchad). Langue du groupe musgu - famille tchadique. Paris, 1978., Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.
- Tourneux, H. & Seignobos, Ch. & Lafarge, F.: Les Mbara et leur langue (Tchad). Paris, 1986., Société d'Études Linguistiques et Anthropologiques de France.
- Tourneux, H.: Place du masa dans la famille tchadique.= Mukarovsky, H.G. (ed.): Proceedings of the Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress. Band I. Wien, 1990., Afro-Pub. Pp. 249-260.
- Trombetti, A.: Le origini della lingua basca. Bologna, 1923., Arnoldo Forni Editore. Published also in *Memorie dell'Accademia delle Scienze dell'Istituto di Bologna. Classe di scienze morali. Serie II*, tomi 8-9 (1923-25).
- Trombetti, A.: Elementi di glottologia.² Bologna, 1977., Arnoldo Forni Editore.
- Urk. VI = Schott, S.: Urkunden mythologischen Inhalts. Heft 1-2. Leipzig, 1929., 1939., J.C. Hinrichs.
- ÜKAPT I-VI = Sethe, K.: Übersetzung und Kommentar zu den altägyptischen Pyramidentexten. I-VI. Glückstadt, Hamburg, 1935-62., J.J. Augustin.
- Vergari, M. & Vergari, R.: A Basic Saho-English-Italian Dictionary. Asmara, Eritrea, 2003., (publisher not indicated).
- Vergote, J.: Phonétique historique de l'égyptien. Paris, 1945., Le Muséon.
- Vergote, J.: Grammaire copte: introduction, phonétique et phonologie, morphologie synthématique (structure des sémantèmes). Tome Ia: partie synchronique. Ib: partie diachronique. Louvain, 1973., Peeters.
- Vernus, P.: Situation de l'égyptien dans les langues du monde.= Fauvelle-Aymar, F.-X. & Chrétien, J.-P. & Perrot, C.-H. (eds.): Afrocentrismes. L'histoire des Africains entre Égypte et Amérique. Paris, 2000., Éditions Karthala. Pp. 169-208.
- Volten, A.: L'étymologie de deux mots coptes.= *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 58 (1959), 21-28.
- Voßen, R.: The Eastern Nilotes. Linguistic and Historical Reconstructions. Berlin, 1982., Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Vycichl, W.: Aigyptiaka. Beiträge zur vergleichenden Hamitosemitistik.= *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 40 (1933), 171-180.
- Vycichl, W.: Hausa und Ägyptisch. Ein Beitrag zur historischen Hamitistik.= *Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen an der Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin* 37 (1934), 36-116.

- Vycichl, W.: Festgabe für Hermann Junker zu seinem 60. Geburtstag.= *Archiv für Ägyptische Archaeologie* 1/6 (1938), 131-140.
- Vycichl, W.: Die ägyptischen Ausdrücke für „Selbst“.= *Muséon* 66 (1953), 41-44.
- Vycichl, W.: Der Umlaut in den Berbersprachen Nordafrikas. Eine Einführung in die berberische Sprachgeschichte.= *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 52 (1955), 304-325.
- Vycichl, W.: Grundlagen der ägyptisch-semitischen Wortvergleiche.= *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Kairo* 16 (1958), 367-405.
- Vycichl, W.: Is Egyptian a Semitic Language?=*Kush* 7 (1959), 27-44.
- Vycichl, W.: Nouveaux aspects de la langue égyptienne.= *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 58 (1959), 49-72.
- Vycichl, W.: Studien der ägyptisch-semitischen Wortvergleiche. Die Klassifikation der Etymologien. Zwölf neue Etymologien.= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 84 (1959), 70-74.
- Vycichl, W.: Ägyptisch-semitische Anklänge.= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 84 (1959), 145-147.
- Vycichl, W.: The Beja Language Tū Beḏawīye. Its Relationship with Old Egyptian.= *Kush* 8 (1960), 252-264.
- Vycichl, W.: Sur les noms des parties du corps en égyptien.= *Chronique d'Égypte* 47 (1972), 173-182.
- Vycichl, W.: Egyptian and Other Hamito-Semitic Languages.= Bynon, J. & Bynon, Th. (eds.): *Hamito-Semitic. The Hague, 1975.*, Mouton. Pp. 201-212.
- Vycichl, W.: Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue copte. Leuven, 1983., Peeters.
- Vycichl, W.: Das Zeichen für d „Hand“ in der Hieroglyphenschrift und die semitischen Entsprechungen des zugrunde liegende Etymons.= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 112 (1985), 169-179.
- Vycichl, W.: The Origin of the Hamito-Semitic Languages.= Jungraithmayr, H. & Müller, W.W. (eds.): *Proceedings of the Fourth International Hamito-Semitic Congress, Marburg, 20-22 September 1983.* Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 1987., John Benjamins. Pp. 109-121.
- Vycichl, W.: Études de phonétique et d'étymologie berbères.= *Journée d'Études de Linguistique Berbère Samedi 11 mars* (1989), 1-18.
- Vycichl, W.: Die hamitosemitische Bezeichnung der „Zunge“.= *Mediterranean Language Review* 4-5 (1989), 23-41.
- Vycichl, W.: La vocalisation de la langue égyptienne. Tome I^{er}. La phonétique. Le Caire, 1990., Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale.
- Vycichl, W.: Etymology.= Atiya, A.S. (ed.): *The Coptic Encyclopaedia*. Vol. 8. New York, 1991., MacMillan. Pp. 118-124.
- Walker, J.H.: *Studies in Ancient Egyptian Anatomical Terminology*. Warminster, 1996., Aris & Phillips Ltd.
- Ward, W.A.: *Comparative Studies in Egyptian and Ugaritic*.= *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 20 (1961), 31-40.
- Ward, W.A.: Review of Lacau, P.: *Les noms des parties du corps en égyptien et en sémitique*.= *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 29/1-2 (1972), 18-23.
- Ward, W. A.: *The Four Egyptian Homographic Roots* b3. Rome, 1978., Biblical Institute Press.
- Ward, W. A.: *A New Look at Semitic Personal Names and Loanwords in Egyptian*.= *Chronique d'Égypte* 71 (1996), 17-47.
- Wb = Erman, A. & Grapow, H.: *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache*. I-V.² Berlin, 1957-1971., Akademie-Verlag.
- WD = Lapp, G. & Lüscher, B.: *Wortdiskussionen*. Provisorische Ausgabe. Band I-III. (Place not indicated), 2002-03., (no publisher).
- Wedekind, K.: Gimo-Jan or Ben-Yem-Om: Benč-Yemsa Phonemes, Tones, and Words.= Hayward, R. (ed.): *Omoti Language Studies*. London, 1990., SOAS. Pp. 68-141.
- Weibegué, Ch. & Palayer, P.: *Lexique lele-français*. Sarh, Tchad, 1982., Centre d'Études Linguistiques.
- Whiteley, W.H.: *A Short Description of Item Categories in Iraqw* (with Material on Gorowa, Alagwa and Burunge). Kampala, 1958., East African Institute of Social Research.
- Wolff, E.: Die sprachliche Situation im Gwoza-Distrikt (Nordostnigeria).= *Journal of African Languages* 10/1 (1971), 61-74.

- Wölfel, J.D.: Eurafrikanische Wortschichten als Kulturschichten.= *Acta Salamanticensia. Filosofía y letras* 9/1 (1955).
- WUS = Aistleitner, J.: Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache.= *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig. Phil.-hist. Klasse* 106/3 (1963).
- Yeivin, Sh.: The Sign 3 and the True Nature of the Early Alphabets.= *Archív Orientální* 4 (1932), 71-78.
- Zaborski, A.: Review of Sasse, H.-J.: *An Etymological Dictionary of Burji*.= *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 7 (1985), 84-92.
- Zaborski, A.: Basic Numerals in Cushitic.= *Jungraithmayr, H.; Müller, W.W. (eds.): Proceedings of the Fourth International Hamito-Semitic Congress, Marburg, 20-22 September, 1983. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 1987., John Benjamins. Pp. 317-347.*
- Zaborski, A.: Der Wortschatz der Bedscha-Sprache. Eine vergleichende Analyse.= *Schuler, E. von (ed.): XXIII. Deutscher Orientalistentag, vom 16. bis 20. September 1985 in Würzburg. Ausgewählte Vorträge. Stuttgart, 1989., Franz Steiner Verlag. Pp. 573-591.*
- Zaborski, A.: Biconsonantal Roots and Triconsonantal Root Variation in Semitic: Solutions and Prospects.= *Kaye, A.S. (ed.): Semitic Studies in Honor of Wolf Leslau. Volume II. Wiesbaden, 1991., Otto Harrassowitz. Pp. 1675-1703.*
- ZÄS = *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* (Leipzig).
- Zeidler, J.: Nochmals zur Etymologie der Handhieroglyphe.= *Göttinger Miscellen* 72 (1984), 39-47.
- Zyhlarz, E.: Die ägyptisch-hamitische Dekade.= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 67 (1931), 133-139.
- Zyhlarz, E.: Ursprung und Sprachcharakter des Altägyptischen.= *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen* 23 (1932-33), 25-45, 81-110, 161-194, 241-254.
- Zyhlarz, E.: Konkordanz ägyptischer und libyscher Verbalstammtypen.= *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 70 (1934), 107-122.
- Zyhlarz, E.: Die Sprachreste der unteräthiopischen Nachbarn Altägyptens.= *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen* 25 (1934-35), 161-188, 241-261.
- Zyhlarz, E.: Die Fiktion der „kuschitischen“ Völker.= *Kush* 4 (1956), 19-33.